BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
3 2354 00409 781 5

6951170

APR
AVR 15 2005

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

J
103
H7
1926
I5
A1

J
103
H7
1926
I5
A1
c.1

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

SESSION 1926

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1926

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	ORDERS OF REFERENCE	iii
2.	REPORTS	v
3.	MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS	vii
4.	MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	1

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, March 16, 1926.

Resolved,—That the following members do compose the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations:—

Messrs. Bell (St. John), Black (Halifax), Bourassa, Bristol, Church, Deslauriers, Garland (Bow River), Geary, Gervais, Grimmer, Hall, Hamilton, Heaps, Heenan, Howard, Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria), Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre), Laflamme, Macphail (Miss), McKillop, Malcolm, McIntosh, Morin (St. Hyacinthe), McMillan, Neill, Prévost, Rinfret, Robinson, Ross (Kingston), Tolmie, White (London), White (Mount Royal), Wilson (Vaudreuil-Soulanges), Woodsworth, Wright—35.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

Attest.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

Ordered,—That the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House: and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Attest.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

Ordered,—That the following Resolution be referred to the said Committee, viz.:

"That, in the opinion of this House, a wage sufficient to provide for a reasonable standard of living should constitute a legal minimum wage."

Attest.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE HOUSE

FIRST REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 21st April, 1926.

Your committee recommends that it be authorized to have its proceedings and such evidence as may be taken, printed from day to day, for the use of the members of the committee and of the House, and that Rule 74 as relating thereto be suspended.

(The First Report was concurred in by the House on April 23rd, 1926.)

SECOND AND FINAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 16th June, 1926.

Mr. McIntosh, from the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations, presented the Second and Final Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

In the House of Commons on March 17th, the resolution, "That in the opinion of this House a wage sufficient to provide for a reasonable standard of living should constitute a legal minimum wage," was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations for examination and report.

Your Committee has held several meetings and made a careful examination of the said Resolution, having regard to the labour provisions of the Treaties of Peace and the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, and the Provincial Legislatures. Six witnesses in all were examined. The witnesses who appeared before your Committee and the subjects respectively dealt with were:— Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, Gerald H. Brown, who traced the history of minimum wage legislation in Canada and the contribution the Federal Department of Labour was trying to make to the effective solution of the many problems arising in the realm of labour in the Dominion; W. Stuart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice, who gave a legal opinion on the question of jurisdiction involved in the Resolution under examination; C. W. Bolton, Statistician, Labour Department, who took up the question of family budgets considered from the point of view of living wages; Margaret S. Gould, Research Department of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees, who further continued the discussion in a specific and detailed manner on family budgets; Albert Hewitson, Departmental Superintendent, Canadian Colored Cottons Limited, Cornwall, Ontario, who made a statement of the wages and conditions existing in a typical Ontario factory town; and Dr. J. W. MacMillan, Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board, who explained minimum wage administration.

The labour principles embodied in the Treaty of Versailles and the other Treaties of Peace recognized the well-being physically, morally and intellectually of industrial wage earners. They are nine in number, the third of which is "The payment to the employees of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of living as this is understood in their time and country." The latter clause of the Peace Treaty was explained by Gerald H. Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, when he gave evidence to the effect that "The labour part

of the Peace Treaties opens with the declaration that if we are going to have peace in the world it must be based on social justice, and there must be a world-wide acceptance of reasonable living and working conditions, and that the principle which is enunciated in the Peace Treaties, and the principle which has already been endorsed by Canada through its acceptance of the Peace Treaties and its approval by Parliament and ratification by proper diplomatic authorities on our behalf constitute acceptance of the idea of minimum wages."

The evidence presented by Dr. MacMillan showed that the principle of the minimum wage as applied to women was working out most satisfactorily. His words, "The very convincing appeal which the Minimum Wage principle makes to the world, is of this nature; it is an assertion of the preciousness, or if you prefer sacredness; the supreme sacredness of human life—the right of the worker to live from his work." Dr. MacMillan further stated that if the principle has been applied to women workers and found satisfactory there is no reason why its scope should not be extended to men. He says, "There seems to be no reason why if this principle is good for women's wages, it should not be applied at least to some classes of men's wages, as a provision that the proper type of law should first be passed and then that the proper type of administration of this law should be applied." It is to be noted in this connection that the British Columbia Legislature at its last session passed a minimum wage act for men applicable to most phases of industrial activities, and that the board appointed to carry out the act is now engaged obtaining data and evidence to enable it to fix the minimum wage for the lumbering industry, the first industry to be dealt with.

The evidence of Family Budgets given by Mr. Bolton and Miss Gould showed the items of family expenditures and the cost in Canada of such budgets. The evidence also showed that some workers in Canada are receiving less than will enable them to adequately maintain this standard. Such an injustice is manifestly unfair and unbusinesslike inasmuch as it costs the country much, involving, as it does, an excess of unrest, ill-health and crime.

It was stated by the Deputy Minister of Justice that according to the British North America Act legislative jurisdiction in regard to minimum wages is vested primarily in the provincial legislatures. He also quoted section 132 as follows: "The Parliament of Canada shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada or any provinces thereof as part of the British Empire, towards foreign countries, arising out of any treaty between the Empire and such foreign countries." Commenting on this he said, "There can be no doubt that where Canada has entered into an obligation by treaty—and in that connection I mean an association with the Empire of course—within the meaning of section 132, which I have just read—I do not think there is any doubt but that Parliament has power to legislate for the purpose of carrying into effect the provision of the treaty." This opinion goes to show that the British North America Act by no means contemplates industrial problems of the kind and scope to which Canadians to-day must adjust themselves.

Your Committee accordingly recommend (*a*) That a conference of Provincial and Dominion representatives intimately in touch with labour conditions throughout Canada be held in the near future to consult as to the best means to be employed of giving effect to the labour provisions of the Treaties of Peace; (*b*) That 10,000 copies of the present report and the evidence upon which it is based be printed, these to be distributed by the Department of Labour, and that Rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

April 21, 1926.

The Meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell (St. John), Garland (Bow River), Gervais, Hamilton, Heaps, Howard, Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria), Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre), Laflamme, Miss Macphail, McIntosh, Neill, Tolmie, Wilson (Vaudreuil-Soulanges), Woodsworth.

The Chairman read the Order of Reference:

> "That in the opinion of this House, a wage sufficient to provide for a reasonable standard of living should constitute a legal minimum wage. —Mr. Woodsworth."

Mr. Gerald Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, addressed the Committee outlining the Provincial legislation on the subject matter of a minimum wage, the International Labour Conference recommendations thereon and the activities of the Labour Department.

The Hon. Mr. Elliott then addressed the Committee.

A motion was presented by Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Mr. Wilson,—

That the proper law officer of the Crown be requested to submit a written opinion on the jurisdictional power of Parliament over the subject matter of "a minimum wage" and that he attend before the Committee in person at a subsequent meeting.

Motion carried.

The Clerk of the Committee duly advised Mr. W. Stuart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice, to submit such opinion in writing and attend before the Committee as and when notified.

Moved by Mr. Hamilton,
Seconded by Mr. Woodsworth,

That the Chairman be instructed to report to the House, recommending that the Committee be given power to have its proceedings and evidence printed from day to day for the use of its members and the members of the House.

Motion carried.

The said Report (see Votes and Proceedings of April 21, 1926) was duly presented by the Chairman and on April 23rd, 1926, duly concurred in.

The Committee then adjourned at the call of the Chair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, April 27, 1926.

The Meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. McIntosh the Chairman presided.

Members present: Messrs. Garland (Bow River), Heaps, Howard, Kennedy (Winnipeg S. C.), McIntosh, McMillan, Neill, Ross (Kingston), Tolmie, Woodsworth, and others.

W. Stuart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice, attended before the Committee and submitted a written opinion as to the jurisdiction of Parliament to legislate on the subject of a minimum wage. The said opinion in writing was read to the Committee by the Chair and Mr. Edwards was questioned by several members of the Committee in respect thereto.

(See this opinion as printed on page 8 post.)

After discussion the Chairman was instructed to nominate a sub-committee to arrange for witnesses and procure attendance of same.

The Committee then adjourned at the call of the Chair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, May 11, 1926.

Committee opened proceedings at 11.15, a.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell (St. John-Albert) Hall, Heaps, Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria), Laflamme, McIntosh, McMillan, Neill, Tolmie, Woodsworth.

Discussion on the question of reporting proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Woodsworth raised the question that a part of the evidence had been printed, but that an equally important and very relevant part had been left out of the printed evidence.

The Chairman asked the opinion of the Committee on this question.

Hon. Mr. Elliott, Minister of Labour, was asked as to his opinion on this matter, and stated that he thought that the point raised by Mr. Woodsworth was sound and in his opinion relevant matters of evidence should all be taken in order that such evidence be fully understood, but that all unnecessary proceedings should be eliminated. The question was one of keeping down the charges of reporting and printing.

The Chairman reported his nominees for the sub-committee on witnesses as follows:—Messrs. Tolmie, Howard and Woodsworth.

This report was adopted.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would meet weekly on Tuesdays, until further notice.

Witness: Mr. Bolton of the Department of Labour was called and sworn and examined on the subject of the "The family budget."

The Committee adjourned till Tuesday, the 18th inst., at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 18, 1926.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell (St. John-Albert), Garland (Bow River), Gervais, Hall, Hamilton, Heaps, Laflamme, McIntosh, McMillan, Morin (St. Hyacinthe), Robinson, White (London), and Woodsworth.

The Sub-Committee on Witnesses and Evidence presented its First Report recommending the calling of the following named witnesses, viz.: Miss Margaret S. Gould, Albert Hewetson, Dr. J. W. MacMillan.

The Report was adopted by the Committee.

Mr. C. W. Bolton, an Officer of the Labour Department, a witness at a previous meeting was in attendance and submitted certain written statements and data to be printed as an appendix to his evidence of May 11, 1926.

Miss Margaret S. Gould, of the Research Department of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Engineers, attended, was duly sworn and gave evidence on the subject of "Family Budgets in Canada." The witness's examination being not concluded at the hour of adjournment she was requested to attend at the next meeting of the Committee.

The clerk was instructed to notify Albert Hewetson, of Cornwall, Ontario, to attend as a witness before the Committee at its meeting on Tuesday the 25th instant.

The meeting adjourned till Thursday, the 20th instant at 10.30 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 25, 1926.

The Meeting came to order at 2 p.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell (St. John), Black (Halifax), Gervais, Heaps, Kennedy (Winnipeg S.C.), Laflamme, McIntosh, Tolmie, Prevost, White (Mount Royal), Woodsworth.

Albert Hewitson, Esq., Overseer in the Cornwall factory of Canadian Colored Cottons Ltd., was called, sworn, examined and discharged.

The meeting then adjourned till Tuesday, June 1, 1926 at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, June 1, 1926.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell, Black, Garland, Hall, Hamilton, Heaps, Heenan, Laflamme, Miss Macphail, McIntosh, McMillan, Neill, Robinson, Ross and Woodsworth—15.

Dr. J. W. MacMillan, Chairman, Ontario Minimum Wage Board, Toronto, Ont., was called and sworn. He addressed the Committee on the question of a minimum wage, and was questioned thereon.

Witness discharged.

Mr. Woodsworth reminded the Committee that all the witnesses called had now been heard.

Moved by Mr. Hamilton,—That the Chairman name a sub-committee to draft a report for presentation to the House on the evidence taken, and submit said draft report at the next meeting of the Committee for approval.

Motion agreed to.

The Chairman accordingly named Messrs. Woodsworth, Tolmie, Miss Macphail and himself to constitute a sub-committee to draft a report.

The Committee adjourned until Tuesday, 8th June, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1926.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., Mr. McIntosh, the Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bell (St. John-Albert), Hall, Hamilton, Heaps, Heenan, Johnstone, Miss Macphail, McIntosh, McMillan, Neill, Robinson, Woodsworth—12.

The minutes of the last meeting—1st June—were read and adopted.

The sub-committee appointed at the last meeting submitted a draft report for approval.

Mr. Neill moved,—That at the end of the first paragraph of page 3 of the draft report the following be inserted, viz:—

It is to be noted in this connection that the British Columbia Legislature at its last session passed a minimum wage act for men applicable to most phases of industrial activities, and that the board appointed to carry out the act is now engaged obtaining data and evidence to enable it to fix the minimum wage for the lumbering industry, the first industry to be dealt with.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Robinson moved,— That recommendation (*b*) at the end of the draft report be deleted and the following substituted therefor:—

(*b*) That 10,000 copies of the present report and the evidence upon which it is based be printed, these to be distributed by the Department of Labour, and that Rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

The draft report, as amended, was adopted as the report of the Committee.

The committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, April 21, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members: If you will come to order we will start our business. You have the Order of Reference for this meeting to-day, which is as follows: "That in the opinion of this House a sufficient wage to provide for a reasonable standard of living should constitute the legal minimum wage." Now, I expect that the first part of the committee's work will be to organize for business, as to what order of procedure you want to follow in connection with this resolution. We have the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour with us this morning, and, personally, I thought that if he spoke to this resolution from the standpoint of the Labour Department, it might give us a background or foundation for the evidence, which we will later produce. What is the wish of the committee in that regard?

Mr. HAMILTON: I move that the Assistant Deputy Minister be heard.

Motion agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask Mr. Brown to come forward and speak to this resolution from the point of view of the Labour Department of the government.

Mr. GERALD BROWN (Asst. Deputy Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen; you were good enough to ask me to appear before this committee, but I did not come prepared to deliver any address, either on labour questions in general, or on the specific subject you have before you, but rather to answer any questions or furnish any information that might be of service.

As reference has been made to the International Labour Organization of the League of Nations, I may perhaps state that the International Labour Organization exists for the purpose of carrying out the portion of the programme enunciated in the Peace Treaties which relates to labour. The Labour Part of the Peace Treaties opens with the declaration that if we are going to have peace in the world it must be based on social justice and there must be a world-wide acceptance of reasonable living and working conditions.

Many of the principles which are enunciated in the Labour Part of the Peace Treaties have already been dealt with at the International Labour Conference by way of specific recommendations, draft conventions and resolutions. The particular subject of the minimum wage which is before you to-day has not yet come before the International Labour Conference. The principle which is enunciated in the Peace Treaties and the principle which has already been endorsed by Canada through its acceptance of the Peace Treaties and its ratification by Parliament and by the proper diplomatic authorities on our behalf, constitutes an acceptance of the idea of minimum wages.

Mr. Woodsworth, in his remarks in the House on this subject—as on most other subjects—has already covered the ground pretty fully. He mentioned in his introduction of the resolution the principle enunciated in the Peace Treaty which forms the basis of his resolution. He has referred to the existence in Canada of minimum wage legislation, and to the existence of similar legislation in other countries as well.

As respects our own country, I have here a brief memorandum dealing with all of the existing Canadian laws on minimum wages. There are laws on minimum wages in seven of the nine provinces of Canada. They relate in all cases to female work,—woman's work and girl's work—with the exception of a statute which has been adopted, during the present winter, in British Columbia. British Columbia in this last mentioned legislation has taken the first step taken in Canada on the subject of minimum wages for men. The act is now in the hands of a commission for administration, as is also the eight hour day law of British Columbia, and the commission has already set about its preparations for the application of the legislation. It is, as you will notice from the memorandum I have distributed, now in effect, and it relates to practically all classes of employment, excepting a very few specified lines, including agriculture.

Now, therefore, you have before you by way of information, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a brief survey of the minimum wage laws which are in existence in the seven provinces of Canada; that is to say, all excepting Prince Edward Island—which has very little industrial development; practically none, they say—and New Brunswick.

It might be worth mentioning that the movement for minimum wage legislation had its origin in the antipodes—in New Zealand and Australia, beginning about 1895 or 1896. It was most pronouncedly identified at the outset with the State of Victoria, Australia. The regulation of minimum wages was carried out, as you are doubtless all aware, through the appointment of Boards, representative of the working interests of the country, of the state, of employing interests, and of the public authorities concerned.

The example of Australia was followed by the adoption of legislation in Great Britain, called "The Wage Boards Act," I think, about 1909 or 1910. From Great Britain it came to the United States. A considerable number of states—I have not at hand at the moment the exact number—have adopted minimum wage laws, and a considerable proportion of the American states, including most of the important industrial states, now have minimum wage laws on their statute books.

We, in Canada, as I have intimated already, have the legislation referred to in this memorandum. Therefore, I think you can all feel that the policy is one which has received the endorsation of legislation already to a very considerable extent.

The laws of Canada on this subject, as on other subjects, show slight variations. Through the Federal Department of Labour we have held conferences with the Provincial governments and have drawn attention to the differences existing in our provincial labour legislation, in respect, for instance, of Workmen's Compensation laws, factory laws, and mining laws, feeling that although we might not have legislative authority in these matters, we were performing a useful service by drawing attention to the divergences, and bringing about by agreement between the provinces, a labour code which would be as nearly uniform as possible in all respects.

In respect of the existing minimum wage laws there is very slight difference, indeed, between the provinces. The actual wage rates are determined, as you all doubtless know, by Boards representative of employers and workers, and of the public authority in each case. The wage rates vary slightly as between provinces, but only slightly. They are shown in the memorandum I have distributed. They apply, in the first place, to beginners—and I am speaking now of the laws governing females—and deal also with learners and experienced workers, providing in all cases minimum rates which are enforcible at law.

The administration of the Minimum Wage Laws of the provinces have, naturally, in the course of the past several years, brought out most of the difficulties that one would expect to find in that field, in an attempt to regulate wage matters by law.

With reference to the inception of the provincial minimum wages laws in most of the provinces the situation was this; that good employers had established standards which they felt were reasonable for girls and women in employment. Other individual firms had not accepted these standards, but custom alone was to some extent securing to women and girls a living wage. What then took place was that the labour people joined hands with representative employers of the better class, and compelled, by legislation, those who were not conforming to fair standards to come into line, so that competition would be equal in all respects. The French have a maxim "La coutume fait loi"—"Custom makes laws", and custom made the minimum wage laws and is the basis in Canada of the legislation which is already on the statute books.

It might be mentioned, perhaps, for general information, that, apart from the legislation, various conferences in Canada have endorsed the principle of minimum wage legislation as a sound principle. I will not go further back than 1919.

In that year a Royal Commission of Inquiry surveyed labour conditions from Sydney, Nova Scotia, to British Columbia; a representative Commission composed of workers' representatives, employers' representatives, and a chairman who was one of the chief Justices of the Province of Manitoba, Chief Justice Mathers. There were also representatives of the House of Commons and the Senate on this inquiry. Their report favoured strongly the principle of minimum wages, and urged that the adoption of minimum wage legislation would assist in allaying the industrial unrest which was so pronounced at that time.

Following that inquiry, a National Industrial Conference was held in Ottawa in the fall of the same year, in September. At that conference one of the items on the agenda was the subject of minimum wages. I might say that the National Industrial Conference was far and away the most representative gathering of its kind which had ever been convened in the history of the country; in fact, it was unique in its composition. It was drawn from the manufacturing and other employing interests of the country through representatives of their own choice; from the working interests, through representatives of their own choosing from the various lines of work throughout the whole country. I think offhand, there were about eighty odd employers' representatives chosen by the employers' organizations, and an equal number of representatives of labour, chosen by labour, from their representative organizations. The Provincial governments of all the provinces of Canada were represented; the municipalities of Canada were represented, the Engineering Institute, and other representative bodies all took part in this gathering, which was held for the purpose of considering measures to allay the then existing industrial unrest.

Now, one of the resolutions of the National Industrial Conference in 1919 was a unanimous pronouncement in favour of a minimum wage law.

Following the conference in 1919 a Royal Commission was appointed in 1920, on which again there were representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers Association on the one hand, the Trades and Labour Congress on the other hand, and provincial representatives from every province in Canada. This Commission was appointed for the purpose of drawing attention to the desirability of uniformity in minimum wage laws, and other labour laws. This Dominion-Provincial Commission, of 1920, approved the principle of a minimum wage for women and girls, and recommended that a competent authority should be created in each province to establish a minimum wage adequate to maintain self-support for women and girls, and that such authority should be empowered to fix hours of employment for such women and girls, not already provided for by legislation. They further recommended that hours of employment should not exceed 48 per week, except for employees engaged in domestic and agricultural movements.

Again, in 1923, we had representatives of the provinces together in Ottawa, —in several cases the Prime Ministers, Ministers of Labour, Deputy Ministers of Labour, and so on,—for the consideration of labour questions which had been referred to us from the International Labour Conference, and for consideration together of the principles enunciated in the labour part of the Peace Treaty, the principles which Mr. McIntosh read earlier this morning. The delegates in attendance at this meeting all joined together in an expression of approval of the adoption of minimum wage legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg South-Centre): Did that apply to minimum wages affecting males as well, or entirely relate to female help?

Mr. GERALD BROWN: The resolution of the Conference read as follows: "This Conference commends to the earnest and early consideration of the various provinces, the matter of the adoption of uniform wage laws for female work."

The question of minimum wages has come up in the first instance by way of protection for those who are less able to protect themselves—the women workers and the girl workers of the country. As far as that is concerned, that is how our factory laws originally came into existence. The early factory legislation was, in a large part, legislation that began with the protection of women and girl workers.

The question of minimum wages for male workers came up at the National Industrial Conference, and was discussed at considerable length. The resolution which was passed on the subject by the National Industrial Conference in 1919, urged that the question of establishing minimum wages for unskilled male workers—in other words, a minimum wage for labour—be submitted to a Royal Commission composed equally of representatives of labour, employers, and the public, which should investigate that subject. The Royal Commission was duly appointed in the following year composed of representatives of the employers and workers of the provinces and of the Dominion, appointed by Order in Council. It dealt with the subject of minimum wages, but did not touch the question of minimum wages for male workers.

I made one mis-statement in reference to the memorandum which has been distributed. It does not deal specifically with the minimum wage law adopted this winter in British Columbia.

Mr. HEAPS: Has not one been passed in Manitoba lately?

The CHAIRMAN: By the last legislature?

Mr. BROWN: For males?

Mr. HEAPS: At the last session.

Mr. BROWN: The session is not over; their legislation in Manitoba has not been approved; it has not been given Royal assent, and so far as I am aware, there is nothing adopted.

The minimum wage law for males in British Columbia is dealt with a little more fully in a memorandum which will be sent to every Member of the committee by mail.

I have not touched, Mr. Chairman, on some of the questions which Mr. Woodsworth perhaps has in mind. Mr. Woodsworth spoke of the basic wage, in his speech in the House, and referred also to the question of legislative jurisdiction as between the Federal Parliament and the Provincial legislature. I am not a constitutional authority, and I am not discussing that latter subject. Any question which the members of the committee would like to ask, I will be pleased to answer so far as I am able.

With reference to wage rates, since the subject of wages is involved in this whole matter; I thought perhaps it was wise to mention that we have in the Department of Labour, published at intervals, a bulletin containing the wage rates in the principal industries throughout the country, and we have made a

beginning in analyzing these figures. If any member of this commitcee does not receive the Labour Gazette, we will be pleased to send it to you, as we would like you all to read it. These bulletins are issued from time to time in connection with the Labour Gazette. One which has been issued since the beginning of the present year deals with the wage rates of labour in the principal centres throughout Canada. The rates of wages are shown in the bulletins, and they must, therefore, be regarded as existing wage scales. Not only that, but there is a comparison in the bulletin by years, going back to pre-war years, and an index number calculation showing the changes which have occurred in wage rates for common labourers and for every occupation.

Mr. Bell (St. John): How are these adjusted between the different localities?

Mr. Brown: The information is obtained by returns from 4,000 employers throughout the country.

Mr. Bell (St. John): There is an adjustment between the localities?

Mr. Brown: Yes. I may add that we have three rates for labour shown in this bulletin. There is a rate for labour in the building industry by itself—since building trades rates sometimes vary from rates in factories. We also have rates for factories—common labourer rates for factories; and we have wage rates of labour for municipalities. We find sometimes that municipality rates are higher than industrial rates. The members of the committee might be interested in knowing that along with this bulletin showing current wage rates, we put out from year to year another small bulletin dealing with the cost of living, admirably convenient volumes.

The Chairman: Does any member of the committee wish to ask any questions of Mr. Brown?

Discussion followed.

The Chairman: The Honourable Mr. Elliott is here, and I understand has to attend a meeting of Council. We would like to have a few words from him before he leaves.

Hon. Mr. Elliott (Minister of Department of Labour): Mr. Chairman, the mover of this resolution, and gentlemen: I am sure that I am pleased to have the opportunity of attending even for a few minutes, at this meeting, although I regret I am not able to say that I have given such consideration to the matter coming before this meeting this morning, as would be of such benefit as I would desire.

This matter was discussed very exhaustively and very ably in the House, but it was not my privilege to be there at that time. However, I have made a more or less cursory survey of what took place there, and it strikes me, first of all, that we must do nothing which will invade the jurisdiction of the provinces. I quite agree that naturally a great good could come by having the law officers of the Crown asked to meet with this committee at such time as you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the committee, decide to meet again, and to discuss with you the question of jurisdiction by the Dominion Parliament, so far as enforcement of a minimum wage scale is concerned. One might suggest that a minimum wage, being so closely related with the question of hours—that is, that wages are so closely related to hours of labour—possibly, in fact, almost probably the same ruling might apply. I understand from the officials of the Department that, so far as they are aware, no decision exactly covering the point, is at hand, and I think it is due to the workers, and the

employers as well, and to everybody interested in this problem, that we should have the best information we can obtain, and if the committee then thinks there is sufficient doubt about it to justify taking some other, and perhaps more expensive course, I know the House would welcome any recommendation that this committee might make, after giving the matter careful consideration, because, after all, this is a matter of very vital importance. We have reached the time when, I think, in every province of the Dominion, and probably every Dominion of the Empire, it is conceded that the prosperity of the country depends to a large extent upon the people who are working in the various spheres of labour, receiving a wage that will enable them to be reasonably happy, and they cannot be happy unless they are receiving a wage that enables them to live, not in luxury, but in some reasonable regard to the wages that people receive, and the manner in which people in other branches of human activities are living. It is a very vital question in that way.

I happen to have before me a copy of Hansard containing the remarks not only of the mover of this resolution, but of Mr. Heenan, and the other gentlemen who spoke on it, and also of Dr. King, who was then Acting Minister of Labour. He puts it this way. (Reading):

> "But the question is, how shall we arrive at our object, and what are our powers? A reference was made to our Courts, and in June last a decision was given which set out the powers relative to hours of labour in industrial employment. The judgment set out that the legislative authority on this subject belonged to the provinces, that if the power to legislate for an eight-hour day is vested in the provinces, presumably the latter are wage matters. That having been decided by our Courts, and the provinces having already moved in the matter, and having set up Minimum Wage Boards dealing with certain classes of labour, the field is cleared to some extent. It is, I think, conceded on all sides that this is a provincial problem. Personally I do not think there would be any harm —in fact, much good might come from the suggestion of the mover of the resolution in this respect—in an adjournment of the debate, and later, when the committees are formed, a reference of the resolution to the committee on Industrial and International Relations. It is a subject that would stand inquiry and investigation by a committee of this House, although this Parliament would not necessarily be committed to legislation along those lines."

I think it should be definitely understood that this committee is not, by taking whatever action it may take, in any way committing itself to one view or other as to legislative jurisdiction. I quite agree with the suggestion that we should have the best authority available in the event of law officers of the Crown advising as to legal matters coming before this committee, and that we should discuss the matter carefully and freely with them. If it is by them decided that it is a matter of provincial jurisdiction, then it will be for the committee to consider whether, after sufficient study, it is a provincial matter or under Dominion Jurisdiction, and if it is decided that it is provincial and not Dominion, they can then decide whether they want to go any farther in testing that question out. If there is sufficient doubt about it, then the committee can decide, what, if any other course shall be adopted, but, I may say, subject to the limitations which I have already placed upon what I think should be the action of the committee, it does seem to me that much good can come from the Dominion considering the matter in the way that the Department of Labour has been in the past considering questions of statistics, cost of living for various families, in various provinces, and the relation which wages in the various provinces bear toward the cost of living. What I have in mind is this; this is connected to a certain extent with the health of the people of the country. After all, comfort, health, decent living, and freedom from worrying about whether you will have

enough to pay for your daily bread, are questions that involve very vitally the happiness of every human, and that being so, I think we want to go into a discussion of the legal aspects of affairs. The Federal government at Ottawa, and its officials, might very well perform, irrespective of the question of jurisdicition altogether, a function similar to what the Federal Department at Washington has performed in regard to health matters. They keep the statistics from every state, in regard to matters relating to health. They consider what methods are being adopted, for instance, to reduce to the lowest possible extent such things as, say infant mortality. What are the steps that are being taken? What are the results that are being produced? How far do these steps contribute to these results? And then by advertising and disseminating this information among the various states, assistance very material in form is put into effect in each state, disseminating the condition that has produced the best results among all the states. It seems to me that a similar work could be done here, irrespective of what the decision may be as to legislative jurisdiction. You can collect information, compile statistics from the various provinces, and compare them. A good deal of that work is covered, I understand, by the work done in the Labour Bureau and Statistical Bureau, and there is no doubt that by hearing the statisticians of the Departments and such authorities as the doctor here (Doctor Hamilton) suggests, it will be time well spent. Personally I would welcome the fullest possible investigation, and I know that the Department will be at the back of the committee in carrying out, within reasonable bounds, anything that will help to solve the problems in the best possible way.

Discussion followed.

The committee adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, April 27, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, honourable members, if you will come to order we will begin our proceedings. You will remember that a week ago to-morrow we met, but simply organized for committee work. At that time the committee was addressed by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Brown, who gave us an outline of the work of his Department, from the standpoint of the resolution which was referred to this committee. Mr. Brown gave us an epitome of the work of his Department and replied to questions asked by members of the committee. Following that, we had an address by the Minister of Labour, the Honourable Mr. Elliott, who concluded his remarks by saying that so far as he was concerned, as Minister of Labour, he would welcome the fullest investigation into the contents and direction of this resolution which is before the committee, and his Department would be behind any reasonable conclusions to which this committee would come. The members of the committee then discussed this resolution for a short time, and decided we had better know where we stood on the question of jurisdiction, and it was decided by the committee that we would get the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in reference to this resolution. We have the Deputy Minister of Justice with us to-day. He has handed me an opinion of the Justice Department on this resolution, and if it is your pleasure, I will read it:

"I have the honour to reply to your letter of the 21st instant, signifying the request of the committee of the House of Commons on Industrial and International Relations for my opinion as to the authority of Parliament to enact legislation for the establishment of a minimum wage. You indicate the desire of the Committee that I should, in my reply, deal with this question (1) generally, having regard to the exclusive and concurrent legislative powers of the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures respectively, and (2) particularly, as affecting the Dominion's own employees whether employed in the province or in the territories.

1. It is a general principle which has been frequently judicially affirmed, that, subject to such restrictions as the law may impose in the public or general interest, 'every person has a right, under the law, as between himself and his fellow subjects, to full freedom in disposing of his own labour or his own capital according to his will.' The establishment of a minimum wage to be paid to any specified class of persons employed in a particular trade or industry, seeing that it must operate to impose a restriction upon that freedom of contract which otherwise obtains between employees and employers, directly affects civil rights of those persons; consequently, legislative jurisdiction with relation to that matter is, subject to the qualifications to be mentioned, vested primarily in the provincial legislatures under either or both of the enumerative heads, 'Property and Civil Rights in the Province' (sec. 92, ss. 13, B.N.A. Act, 1867) and 'Generally all Matters of a merely local or private Nature in the Province' (sec. 92, ss. 16, B.N.A. Act, 1867).

In view, however, of various decisions of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, the general proposition above stated must be understood subject to two qualifications, viz.:—

First, with regard to such operations, works and undertakings as are within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the Dominion—for example, the classes of works and undertakings described in sec. 92, ss. 10 (a), (b) and (c), B.N.A. Act, 1867—it is no doubt within the competence of Parliament to fix and regulate minimum rates of wages to be paid to persons employed on or in connection with such operations, works or undertakings. Legislation enacted for that purpose would probably be sustained upon the view that it was an enactment which, though modifying civil rights of the persons affected, might be regarded as truly ancillary or necessarily incidental to, if not strictly within the inherent scope of, the enumerated classes of subjects in section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867. To the extent that such legislation may be merely ancillary or necessarily incidental to the exercise by Parliament of the powers conferred upon it, the effect of the legislation, if enacted, is that provincial authority in relation to the subject-matter thereof is superseded and remains inoperative so long as the Dominion legislation continues in force. But until Parliament so legislates, the primary authority of the provincial legislatures in relation to that subject-matter remains, subject to the qualification next mentioned, unimpaired and unrestricted.

Secondly, the Parliament of Canada has exclusive legislative jurisdiction to regulate and fix the rates of wages to be paid to the servants or employees of the Dominion Government, wherever they are employed, whether in the provinces or in the territories or outside of Canada.

2. The Parliament of Canada possesses exclusive legislative authority to enact minimum wage laws for those parts of Canada which are not within the boundaries of a province."

The CHAIRMAN: That, gentlemen, is the opinion of the law officers of the Department on this important question. What is the wish of the committee?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: I move that Mr. Edwards be heard.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. W. STUART EDWARDS (Deputy Minister of Justice): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I did not understand that my attendance was requested in order that I might make any general statement upon the subject. I anticipated that I was simply summoned here as a witness, to answer any questions which any member of the committee might wish to ask. I may remind the committee, however, that in 1924 when the committee had before it for consideration the question of the eight-hour day, the same constitutional principles which are involved in this question, were fully considered, and an opinion along the same lines as that which has been given to-day, was given with regard to the eight-hour day question. I understand the committee recommended that the question be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. The reference was made, and the judgment of the Supreme Court has been given, which, in general terms, is along the same lines as the opinion which I submitted to the committee this morning. Unless, therefore, there be some specific matter as to which any member might wish to ask a question, I do not think I have anything to add to what has been said by the Supreme Court and the Department as to the constitutionality of the subject.

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Edwards, could you give us a brief outline of the clause referred to in the B. N. A. Act?

Mr. NEILL: Where can we find the decision of the Supreme Court on the eight-hour law?

Mr. EDWARDS: It is in the Canada Law Reports, in part VII, published on the 30th of September, 1925, at page 505.

Answering the honourable member's question with regard to the provisions of Section 92, subsection 10, paragraphs a, b, and c. I will read the provisions to the committee. As the committee is aware the legislative jurisdiction under the B. N. A. Act is divided between the Dominion and the provinces. In section 91 you have the Dominion enumerated subjects, and in Section 92, the provincial enumerated subjects, and I am reading from Item 10 of the provincial subjects, as follows:

> "Local works and undertakings, other than such as are of the following classes (a) lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting a province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province; (b) lines of steamships between the provinces and any British or foreign country, such works as although wholly situated within the province, are before or after their execution, declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or to the advantage of two or more of the provinces."

So that those exceptional works referred to in paragraph 10 are taken out of the jurisdiction given to the provinces, and by Item 29 of paragraph 91, they are vested in the Dominion. The effect is that the Dominion has jurisdiction over such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the class of subjects in this Act, assigned exclusively to the legislature of the provinces. So what is excluded in 92-10 is vested in the Dominion, and the effect of the opinion given is that with regard to such excepted works and undertakings, the Dominion Parliament would have exclusive power to legislate regarding the minimum wage.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is one question I would like to ask, Mr. Edwards. Would you care to express an opinion as to whether the delegates from Canada, who signed the Treaty which included the Labour Conventions, of which this is one, acted unconstitutionally in so signing, without considering the civil property clauses of the British North America Act—I mean, does Canada have the right to sign on behalf of provinces commitments involving the jurisdiction of those provinces, according to your decision?

Mr. EDWARDS: As to that, I would not be prepared to give any considered opinion this morning, but I might direct the attention of the committee to the provisions of Section 132 of the British North America Act of 1867, which reads as follows:—

> "The Parliament of Canada shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada, or of any province thereof, as part of the British Empire, toward foreign countries, arising out of any Treaty between the Empire and such foreign countries."

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This of course does not come exactly within that clause.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Edwards, what does that clause mean unless it means that if we enter into an obligation as a signatory of a Treaty, we are obliged to carry it out? That is, that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government would take precedence over that of the provinces in such matters.

Mr. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that, having read that report, with the expression of the opinion on this question from the Supreme Court of Canada, I would gather from that expression that the obligation with respect to all those matters which come within the province of the Dominion itself—the Dominion Parliament would have the right to regulate the minimum wage or such terms upon which these men and women would be employed on public works under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, but all other questions which were not under the Dominion jurisdiction would be subject to the jurisdiction of the various provinces of the Dominion. That is the way it appears to me.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to ask Mr. Edwards one more question. He has read the clause from the British North America Act. I wonder if, in his opinion, the clause in so far as it relates to Treaty obligations, would not give the Dominion Government jurisdiction, or make the Dominion Government's jurisdiction to take precedence over the jurisdiction of the provinces?

Mr. EDWARDS: I think, Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that where Canada has entered into an obligation by Treaty—and in that connection I mean an association with the Empire of course, within the meaning of Section 132, which I have just read—I do not think there is any doubt but that Parliament has power to legislate for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Treaty.

Discussion followed.

The committee adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, MAY 11th, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 11.00 A.M., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we have a quorum, so we will proceed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Before we start, Mr. Chairman, may I call your attention to one matter?

(Discussion followed *re* reporting of discussions)

The CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Bolton here to-day from the Labour Department, who will speak to us in connection with the Family Budget, from the point of view of the Department. I will ask Mr. Bolton to come forward.

CHARLES WILLIAM BOLTON called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are connected with the Department of Labour?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What position do you hold in the Department?—A. Statistician.

Q. I think we will let you give your outline yourself, of what you have to say to us this morning.—A. I understand you wish me to speak about family budgets considered from the point of view of the living wage. Family budgets were originally constructed—that is, in modern times—by social investigators whose object was to ascertain or to show the living conditions of people in particular localities. The best known of these budgets is that of Rowntree in York, about twenty years ago. I think you have all heard of the elaborate studies of the life of the poor in London by Charles Booth. Mr. Rowntree, who is a manufacturer of candy and chocolate in York, made such an investigation in York, and constructed a family budget. His object was to find out whether the poor people in York were getting enough to live on, and were living decently. He found out what they consumed, what they bought, and what their wages were, and the size of their families, and he worked out quite an elaborate formula to decide what should be regarded as a standard family. You have heard the contention that a family of five,—that is a man, wife and three children, was not a standard family; it was above the average. The average appears to be around two or two and one half children. Rowntree considered all the families which he investigated, and calculated that if you took a man, wife, and one child, you would be away below the mark, while if you took a man, wife, and four children, you would have something which would not be representative of a considerable proportion, and finally he concluded that if he took a man, wife, and three children, he would be nearest to the average, rather than by taking a man, wife, and any other number of children. As I said before, this was about twenty years ago, and until recent years there has not been much objection to that system. He then worked out a budget—that is, a budget of his own—to see how little a man, wife, and three children could live on in York. His budget came to about twenty-one shillings. In July, 1914, he made out another budget, which cost about thirty-five shillings, based on a little higher standard.

Q. What date was it that the first budget was worked?—A. I don't remember the exact date; it was around twenty years ago; early in the 1900's; I think it was about 1901. Then again for July, 1914, he worked out a budget for a woman just keeping herself, which came to £1, twenty shillings, per week.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. What was the time of that budget?—A. The same date; July, 1914. The two budgets for 1914 were worked out during the war. He took July, 1914, as a standard period because the British government was using that date as the basis for its cost of living index number. Now, when Mr. Rowntree worked these budgets, he wanted to demonstrate that these people in York who were living in poverty, were not living in poverty because they were wasting their money. He found from his investigation that they were in poverty because the ordinary wages were less than twenty-one shillings; twenty shillings was a common wage in those days.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What was the average wage at that particular date, when Mr. Rowntree made his budget?—A. In the district which he was investigating it was around twenty shillings.

Q. The average?—A. Yes, for labourers; for skilled men it would be a little higher.

Q. And what was his family budget?

Mr. Bell (St. John): Thirty-five shillings.

The Witness: No, his family budget was twenty-one shillings.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. For how many hours per working week?—A. He did not figure that; he figured only on income.

Q. Twenty-one shillings a week without any definite number of hours?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Could you give us any idea of what the family budget included?—A. I have not got it here. The object was to get the maximum of nutriment and comfort at the minimum of expense.

Q. Did he not at the same time, in the book he published afterwards, dealing with his own findings, state that one-third of the whole British population was living on the border line of poverty?—A. He made a great many statements of that nature.

Q. This was about that particular period?—A. Yes. I was studying his report from the standpoint of the budget. I wanted to get at it because Rowntree was satisfied that he could find the occasion for this poverty and the remedy. A lot of people had the idea that it was due to the waste of money in drink and other nonsense, and he found that it was due to lack of wages, partly unemployment, and partly low wages, and he worked this budget to show that the most efficient housekeeper you could imagine could not keep a family on less than twenty-one shillings. Now, I have said so much about Mr. Rowntree's budget because it has recently been taken as somewhat of a standard in South Africa. I had not heard of it or run across any reference to it for a good many years, but very recently South Africa made use of it.

A. In the United States there have been a great many budgets constructed by social investigators and by government officials for various purposes. The early ones, as in England in the case of Mr. Rowntree, constructed their budgets to show the very least that people could live on—

Q. Before you leave that year 1914, would you mind telling us the average wage at that time, as compared with the budget of thirty-five shillings you said was the standard? Give us the spread, if any, between the actual cost of living and the wages they were earning?—A. Twenty or twenty-five shillings in England was a good wage for labourers before the war.

Q. You said something about thirty-five shillings?—A. Mr. Rowntree made a budget which cost thirty-five shillings.

Q. That would mean, if that budget was correct, that thirty-five shillings was about fourteen shillings more than the labourer was receiving?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

Q. He made it as close as he could?—A. No, he found the people were living in poverty because the wages were too low, and not because people were wasting their money. In England there have always been allegations that the people are poor because they waste their money in drink.

Q. He wanted to show the comparison between wages and the cost of living? —A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. If I get this rightly into my head, Mr. Bolton, you have stated that while twenty-one shillings was a good wage twenty years ago——

Mr. McMillan: In 1914.

The Witness: Twenty-one shillings was twenty years ago.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. ——that would be 1906?—A. Yes.

Q. At the same time Rowntree's investigation shows that a man actually required thirty-five shillings a week to live in even moderate comfort? Is that correct?

Mr. McMillan: That was in 1914.

The Witness: The cost of living had risen about twenty per cent in that interval.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. Is there any finding as to what it cost twenty years ago—the time you say twenty-one shillings was the average wage? What was the cost of living at that time according to Mr. Rowntree?—A. He found twenty-one shillings was the minimum living wage—around £1 a week.

Q. Then you come to 1914, and he says thirty-five shillings.—A. It was a higher standard.

Q. Well, what were the wages—the cost of living?

Mr. McMillan: Yes, what were the wages?

The Witness: He made another budget which was a little higher.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. What were the wages in that time?

Mr. McMillan: Twenty-one shillings.

The Witness: No; they went up a little.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. If we are going to get a comparison, it would seem to me that the cost of living and the average wage at different times, are material. Could you tell us the average wages?—A. I have not the figures here; I do not remember exactly what the rise in England was.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Have you this publication from which we could get that?—A. Yes, figures are being published all the time.

Mr. McMillan: It would be well to have it in here.

Hon. Mr. Elliott: While you are getting that, I would like you to get the figures for the year 1908, if there is any record generally, showing the average wage and cost of living in the different countries which you think have a definite bearing upon our conditions here, because that is the year that the wages were fixed in a number of cases, for instance, in the Civil Service. They were fixed in 1908. There were also certain other arrangements made at that time which might be of value to some of the employees in the Civil Service.

The Witness: The statistics of prices and the cost of living prior to 1914 were quite irregular. It was during the war that the practice became common in different countries for collecting and publishing on a uniform basis regular statistics of wages in connection with the cost of living. I think I can secure some on this point. I had another point in mind in mentioning Mr. Rowntree's budget, and his comparison with wages in England. About 1908 there was an investigation in the city of New York similar to the one Mr. Rowntree made in England. This was made by Doctor Chapin, and is the best known budget of that kind in the United States, and is used to a great extent as the standard for minimum costs of living in the cities. I might point out from that that there is a big difference in the minimum cost of living in the cities and in the country, and practically all these budgets which have been constructed apply to cities—large cities, not small ones—like London, New York, and the large industrial centres where rents are usually high, and housing conditions are bad. I don't remember exactly what Doctor Chapin's budget for New York was, but I think it was around $800 per year.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What year was that?—A. About 1908 or 1906. When social investigators and statisticians use his budget now, they generally take the cost of living index number, and bring it to the equivalent of to-day's figures. There were a great many investigations of that kind made in the United States prior to the war. What I have said covers the first class of family budgets which were made; that is, to ascertain or to demonstrate how little people can live on, and to show the actual conditions under which they are living. Now, another common practice for constructing a family budget, is to afford a basis for minimum wages, which is an entirely different thing. When you proceed to establish a minimum wage, you want to adopt some kind of standard, and usually the idea is not to adopt the standard upon which one can barely exist, but a standard which is regarded as reasonable in the country in question. For instance, in Australia in 1920, I think it was, the government appointed a commission to ascertain such a minimum wage, and the commission frankly adopted a standard which would be regarded as the average of the prevailing standards for Australia. In the budget they worked out, they found they were way above the average, that is, the wages necessary to pay for such a budget were substantially above the average.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. I don't quite catch that. Please state that again.—A. They set out to construct a budget on the average living conditions in Australia, and when they worked it out, they found that the wage necessary to buy that budget was way above the average.

Q. How do you account for that?—A. They were working on a higher standard than apparently actually existed.

By the Chairman:

Q. Was that for skilled or unskilled workers?—A. Unskilled.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Do you mean to say the Australian standard is higher than that of other countries?—A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. I confess I am a little puzzled there myself. Is what you mean to say that they found the actual cost of living in reasonable comfort was greater than the wages the labourers were actually receiving?—A. What I meant to say was that the commission thought they had adopted an Australian standard of living, and they worked a budget to show that, and to put it down in figures, and when they got through their budget cost was above the average wage. The standard which they adopted was higher than the prevailing standard.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What year was that?—A. That was about 1920.

Q. Has there been an investigation since?—A. Not of that kind.

Q. Speaking of the Australian system: in Australia they have a minimum wage in many of the states?—A. Yes, and in the Federal government as well.

Q. Are not these minimum wages given as to male and female labour, higher than most other countries for the same standard of work? That is, allowing for the Australian workers a higher standard of living?—A. I do not think Australian wages are as high as the United States.

Q. Well, speaking of averages; I am not speaking of a few selected trades. If you get the average wage, how would it compare with the American worker? —A. It is practically impossible to ascertain the average wage in any country.

Q. For instance, I have in my room statistics showing the average wage for the railroad workers.—A. That is only one industry.

Q. You have that for other industries. There are certain trades which are higher, and others which are lower?—A. Yes, but the average for a country is practically impossible to ascertain.

Q. Do you think the low rate of the American workers in a given period is equal to the minimum rate established in Australia?—A. It is higher.

Q. In the United States?—A. You are talking about wages—

Q. Yes, translated into labour.—A. The International Labour Office publishes a paper which shows it is higher than in any other country in the world.

Q. Does it take into consideration the hours of labour?—A. 48 hours a week, as a standard.

Q. In the United States?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you the wages paid in the United States?—A. There is a book containing all these things, which is published every three months.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Did you say Canada was the second highest?—A. Yes, and once in a while Australia comes up to us here, for a month, and then may drop back again. Sydney, Australia, will be about the same as Ottawa.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. I find I have to leave to attend a meeting, but before I go may I make this suggestion? I fancy the members of the committee will be interested, and, therefore, as far as you can, will you bring with the tables of 1906, 1908 and 1914, one down to about 1920, which I think was about the peak—A. Yes.

Q. —and then for each year since then? I do not believe we are as familiar with these statistics as you are, or as are the people who have been directly interested in labour, and a table showing the changes which have taken place in the hours of labour would be interesting. Let us have that as far as you can go; for instance, this twenty-one shillings; how many hours of labour a week were paid for, how the hours of labour have changed, and so forth, so we can get a view of it, right up to the present time, or to the last available date, say last June or July.

The CHAIRMAN: Your idea is to get the relationship between the wages and the hours?

Hon. Mr. ELLIOTT: A table showing the cost of living—I mean, on a moderate scale—the wages paid for certain hours, and so forth, which will give us a fairly good survey of the situation.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would suggest, just there, that there is another factor which would not be out of place here; it is a most important factor, and that is the number of days actually worked in the year. For instance, in the case of miners; they work perhaps only three or four days in the week, and the conclusions from an average statement would be absolutely vitiated.

Hon. Mr. ELLIOTT: You are quite right about that, and there are other important industries in the same position, such as workers on railway trains, who have to move around, and perhaps keep two rooms, or else pay the cost of living in different places. Of course, in order to make an accurate comparison, you would have to keep separated some classes of employment and the amount of night work as compared with day work. For instance, the Postal Department; they claim they work more at nights, and have to be on call any time, and for that reason they should get a different wage than people who have regular hours, starting at nine in the morning, and continuing until five at night. That seems reasonable.

Mr. HEAPS: You would not be able to get all the details?

Hon. Mr. ELLIOTT: No, but you can get a pretty accurate survey of the wages and the hours, and the cost of living in similar classes of work.

Mr. HEAPS: You can, if you go into it far enough, but if you want to make a good comparison, you would have to take the eight-hour day as a basis, and then work from that. You are mapping out a pretty big programme.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Would you not have to take the eight-hour basis?—A. They have in Australia and the United States; they work out index numbers showing the changes in the cost of living, and in hourly wages, and in weekly wages, in hours per week, and in unemployment. When you get all these index numbers and work them together, you can get an index number fairly close to an average wage.

By Hon. Mr. Elliott:

Q. This is all worked out in the Department?—A. We don't work all these index members, but I think they do in Australia, and most of them in the United States.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would suggest that Mr. Bolton finish his statement first, so that he will cover the entire field.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. I suppose you have not taken into consideration the farms? They are not taken into consideration at all?—A. The statistics of wages of agricultural workers are not on so extensive a scale as those of industrial workers.

Q. And, so far as the products of the farms are concerned, they are not considered in any way?—A. Most of the agricultural departments in the United States are making statistics of that kind. I have seen budgets about farm families just recently. While you are on that point: I said a while ago that the cost of living in cities is much different from the country. I might have stated that in England in 1914 the prevailing wages for agricultural labourers was fourteen shillings per week, and, of course, they lived on it, but how, I don't know. At the present time I think it is around thirty, but they are going down a bit. I mentioned two purposes for which family budgets were constructed; first, to show actual living conditions, and, secondly, to ascertain the basis for a minimum wage, but there is another, which is to measure changes in the cost of living from time to time; that is, the rise and fall. That also shows all cost of living index numbers which are made from the budgets. There is a good deal of difficulty about family budgets, because people will take a family budget, which is constructed for one purpose, and use it for another, for which it was not constructed. Someone will take a budget such as Rowntree made to show the least you could live on in England, and use it for the basis of a minimum wage, or they will take a budget like Chapin's in New York and use it to make an index number, showing changes in the cost of living. These budgets are more or less useful for that purpose, but they are not always exactly truthful; they are not always exactly capable of showing exactly what you want to show, so you are likely to get a little margin there one way or the other. A clear statement as to budgets was given by Professor Paul Douglas, of Chicago University. He published a book called "Wages in the Family" and contributed to a report on "Family Allowances" and he said that a family budget can be divided roughly into four kinds. Some investigators fail to recognize these four kinds, and get into difficulty. The first he named is "The Poverty Level," which he says costs about $1,100 in large American cities. The second is the "Minimum Subsistence Level," which he says costs about $1,400 in large American cities. The third is the "Health and Subsistence Budget" which costs about $1,600—$1,600 or $1,700; and the fourth is the "Comfort Budget" which costs about $2,400 in large American cities. He says that many people make budgets which he would put into one of these four categories, but which the author would put in another. For instance, many budgets have been made in the United States corresponding to his "Comfort Level"; that is, the "Comfort Level" of Professor Douglas, and the author of the budget would call it a "Minimum Subsistence Budget." The author is there setting a very high standard as a minimum of subsistence. He says that you cannot live on less than $2,400. Others will go so far as to make a "Health and Subsistence" budget, and say you are living in poverty if you are living in that level. Now, some investigators make only three categories of budgets; they leave out the comfort one, what they call the "Health and Subsistence" budget—I mean, they make a "Health and Subsistence" budget, which Douglas would call a "Comfort" budget; otherwise, they are the same. If you keep these four categories in mind, in regard to the Douglas budgets, you are not likely to get the principles mixed up. When budgets are used for the basis of the minimum wage, as it is attempted to do in Australia, you would get into an impossible situation, as they did there, by attempting to use a "Health and Subsistence" budget, instead of a "Minimum Subsistence" budget. That is practically what occurred in Australia. It was practically a "Health and Subsistence" budget, and they intended to use it as a "Minimum Subsistence" budget, and they found it was impossible. The government and the investigators who looked into it found that the income of Australia was insufficient to provide for it. The result was that the whole proposition fell through.

I may as well state what has been going on in Australia, although Mr. Woodsworth has described it in his address in the House. As early as 1907 the

standard was set up for fixing the average wages for men. Mr. Justice Higgins was the Chairman of the Board appointed to set that up. He adopted a certain wage for a certain man—I forget what it is, but it does not matter, he found some public service corporations were paying it, and I think the city corporation of Melbourne was paying it, and quite a number of large employers of labour. From year to year, as he was called upon to set the minimum wage, he adjusted the figures in an index number, and by 1920 this minimum wage had risen considerably, of course. The people in Australia were saying that it was pretty low, that the minimum wage was not high enough to keep these labourers in decency, so this commission was appointed to ascertain what amount was required to keep them in decency. The result was not very satisfactory to the Arbitration Board of the Commonwealth, and the Arbitration Boards of some of the cities, as far as skilled workers in various industries were concerned, and they have had this standard before them, in the meantime,—which is about five years—and it has tended to raise the level, so it looks now as if they will get up to a proper standard some day. Professor Douglas reported they were only fifteen per cent below it, whereas in 1920, when it was brought out, they were very considerably below it.

So far, I have been talking about the principles of budgets. I may speak of some of those in use. The family budget published in the Labour Gazette is the one most used in Canada. It was constructed a good many years ago. The constructing of a family budget was new in those days, and it did not show the changes in the cost of living as exactly as it might have if it were constructed now. It was heavily loaded with potatoes, because there were no other fresh vegetables in it, and there are two or three points in it which spoiled it a little. We have been constructing one now for some time, and I expect we will have it completed before very long. The Labour Gazette has only included twenty-nine staple foods, coal, wood, coal oil, and the rent of a six-room house,—a working man's house. The other items in the cost of living, such as clothing, boots, and miscellaneous expenses, have not been covered. About five years ago the changes in clothing and other items had become so important that some account had to be taken of them, so we got some figures and worked out the changes from time to time, and from the budget and these other figures, we constructed a tentative cost of living index number, which we publish at the end of each year. In the United States, the Bureau of Labour Statistics has published an index number of the retail price of food for a good many years, and during the war they secured figures for other items, that is, fuel, rent, clothing and sundries, and they make up a group called "House Furnishings," which most investigators put in with "Sundries." The United States government, during the war—in 1918—made a very extensive investigation of the cost of living all over the United States. They secured figures from about 40,000 families and they used the information so secured to weight the cost of living index number; that is, to allow for the importance of each article in the calculation, according to its importance in the consumption of the family. I suppose it was the most important investigation ever made, and cost a huge sum of money. It was done because all through the United States, wages for people working on government contracts were being adjusted according to the changes in the cost of living, and it was necessary to have a very accurate system for determining the changes; otherwise, I do not think any government would have appropriated the money for such a purpose. They intend to make another investigation of that kind as soon as they can get some money.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have several questions here I would like to ask the witness.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Would the result of the American investigation be available to us?—A. Yes. It has been published in a book called "Cost of Living in the United States". I might mention something which this investigation showed. At that time—1918—the investigators found that the average family covered was getting about $1,400 a year income, and that would include the wages of the father and any earnings of the rest of the family. The investigation was confined to average families; that is, families with about three children. They found that when the income fell below $1,400, the family did not get enough to eat.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. May I ask a question, Mr. Bolton, in connection with Canada? What is the average family, according to the figures of the Labour Department?—A. The one in the Labour Gazette?

Q. Yes.—A. We do not say the number in the family, but we say "the average family" and we also say that "the average family is about five." The food, fuel, and rent, come to about $21 per week. Those are the only items.

Q. Supposing the other items which we considered—A. They add about half as much again.

Q. It would go to about $31 or $32 a week?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, have you any idea of what the average wages are in different groups in the Dominion of Canada?—A. No. In Ottawa, carpenters get 75 cents per hour and they work 44 hours per week when on steady employment. That is about $33 per week.

Q. That is a highly skilled man, if he were working continually 52 weeks in the year, would be getting what is equal to the minimum family budget according to the Bureau of Labour.—A. Perhaps you were not in when I said that the budget was constructed to the rise and fall of the cost of living, and not the minimum. We do not know what the minimum is.

Q. $33 a week might be a very low standard for many people.—A. The budget published in the Labour Gazette conforms practically to the third one mentioned by Paul Douglas—about $1,650 per year.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. There are a few questions I would like to ask you, Mr. Bolton. Judging from your experience, and the work you have done on this subject, how would you say the people actually live if they are getting less than the minimum subsistence budget?—A. I mentioned the United States investigators in 1918 found that when the family income was less than $1,400, the family did not get enough to eat. They found they economized on their food to such an extent that they were not getting a healthy diet; they found they did not have enough rooms to live in; there would be perhaps five people living in four rooms; they might be living in a six roomed house, and renting two rooms, and that is a very common basis for economy—many people whose income is low and rent is high, rent part of the house. Another plan is to keep boarders, which is equivalent to the same thing.

By the Chairman:

Q. Humanely, that family would be neglected?—A. Yes.

Q. And educationally they would be making no advancement?—A. They might be getting enough to eat, but living in two or three rooms, which is not very healthy.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. In a case of malnutrition, who pays the bill?—A. The death rate is usually high.

Q. Is it in direct ratio with the amount of malnutrition?—A. It affects the community indirectly in every respect.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Would you mention a few instances of what you mean, judging from what the investigators have found out?—A. First of all, the children grow up to—it is hard to describe these things—the children grow up without sufficient food and strength; they do not fully develop. For instance, I read some time ago that the average height of the English people went down a certain number of inches in the generation, ending about 1845.

By the Chairman:

Q. At that rate, it has the same effect on the physical growth and development of a nation as serious wars cropping up now and then would have?—A. Yes; these people figured this all out from statistics.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Would it not effect a greater cost to the municipalities for hospitals?—A. No doubt of that. There is no doubt that malnutrition and bad housing are the principal causes of disease.

Q. In the case of economic and housing conditions, what would be the evil effect as shown in the big cities?—A. I heard in Ottawa some years ago that some organization took a map of the city and they secured the addresses of those who had died from tuberculosis, for one year—no, for a period of years—and they put a dot in each of those addresses on the map, and they found the dots were all in little spots; that is, for instance, at 41 Church Street they put dots there several times in five years. It showed that the deaths often occurred in the same house from time to time.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. That is not true to-day. The anti-tubercular effort is working wonderfully.—A. Yes, and the remedy for that is obvious. In fact, there are two remedies. One is to remove the bad housing, and the other is to build decent—

Mr. BELL (St. John): I know in my own county they are making wonderful strides in the prevention of tuberculosis.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Have you any information as to how far the inability to buy clothing results in the patronizing of second-hand stores, and so on?—A. I have no information on that.

By the Chairman:

Q. I want to interject something, which is perhaps my own idea, but based on my knowledge of social work, and I would like to know whether you can confirm this; that a very large number of the lower paid workers must certainly buy their clothing second-hand, some of it not very fit for wear.—A. That is perhaps the third chief source of economy. I have mentioned economies, in their food and housing; then they will economize in their clothing in two ways, by going without what they can, and getting what they must have as cheaply as possible, even if it is second-hand. There is another thing I was going to mention about the lack of food. It is well known—and I do not need to give it as my own opinion—and it is constantly referred to in this investigation (indicating) that children who are not properly fed do not get along at school, but leave school before they ought to, for instance, when they are fourteen they are only in third book instead of being through. They never dream of going to high school, and they do not learn trades because they have not got the stamina and ambition to learn a trade. They drift into blind-alley occupations, in order

to supplement the family's income, and in many cases they come to a bad end, even getting into crime.

Q. One of the sources of social expenditure would be the crime resulting from or arising out of the lack of a sufficient family budget?—A. Yes. Investigators of these things agree on that. I do not think there are any statistics for it.

Q. With regard to questions such as the provision of real education to the children, anything in the form of high school or of literature for the home, or occasional educational trips anywhere—is there any provision of that kind made for that in these family budgets?—A. The only one that includes anything of that kind is this "Comfort" budget. They do have a small allowance for that.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. That is the maximum budget?—A. $2,400.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. The other budgets do not do it?—A. No; even in the $1,600 budget the allowance for that must be very small; it is usually confined to a newspaper and one weekly journal.

By the Chairman:

Q. In that "Comfort" budget, of $2,400 a year; is there any chance or opportunity of saving any money from that budget from year to year?—A. I think the "Comfort" budget has a small allowance for that, but it is generally in the shape of life insurance.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Mr. Bolton, I will speak for the time being on the small budget which allows for the bare existence of life—approximately $1,600 per year— —A. That is what Paul Douglas calls the "Health and Decency" budget. The minimum he takes is $1,400. I will tell you what class of workers fall into the income sufficient for the "Comfort" budget; such workers as the highest class of skilled workmen, such as railway employees who get the highest wages, and some classes of printers. The "Health and Decency" budget is one secured by printers when in steady work, and all printers have pretty steady work; and the minimum subsistence, about $1,400 a year or $1,200 in the smaller cities, is secured by labourers in steady employment such as builders, and other labourers who do not get steady employment, and the class of factory workers who are semi-skilled, and have fairly steady work. The poverty level is that which pertains to unskilled labourers who are out of work more or less, and have to get along the best way they can. Of course, on the poverty level Paul Douglas says they do not get enough to live on, and are going downhill all the time.

Q. I am trying to reach the conclusion, first of all—the minimum standard is $1,400, according to Paul Douglas?—A. Yes.

Q. And the next thing I am trying to arrive at is the actual wages received in Canada. You made the statement that labourers receive approximately a certain amount of money per year. I do not know what the wages received by certain people are in eastern Canada, but I am familiar with the railroad workers in the city of Winnipeg, the highest paid mechanics working in the railway shops in Winnipeg. There are three of them there; we have one at Weston on the C.P.R., at Fort Rouge on the Canadian National, and then the Transcontinental shop at Transcona, which is really part of the city of Winnipeg. In these shops the figures I get from the men employed there show that the maximum earnings of a skilled mechanic, if he works every hour the shop is open during the year, average $115 per month. When you deal with

the wages amounting to 50 or 60 cents an hour, with the men working 48 hours a week, it does not amount to very much. These amounts must be computed from what a man can earn if he works all the time the work is there. In that case, I would say that the wages received by the highest skilled workers in Canada, such as in the railroad shops in Winnipeg, work out actually at less than the minimum allowance provided for by Mr. Douglas himself.—A. The rate for skilled men throughout Canada is 70 cents an hour, and 44 hours per week are standard hours. That would come pretty well up to $1,400 a year.

Q. But he cannot work the hours when the shop is closed?—A. I mentioned that in giving the classes of labour. We are trying to arrive at something like a definite figure.

Q. Your $1,400 does not apply to the United States?—A. I said the largest cities in the United States; they are much larger than any in Canada.

By Mr. Thomas Bell:

Q. I thought that your figures were based on the figures in the United States?—A. I was talking about the United States.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. How do the figures as regards the cost of living and wages in Canada correspond with the figures, the minimum in the United States?—A. The figures in Canada and the United States are very similar, but the larger cities in the United States are much larger than the cities in Canada. The larger cities in Canada correspond to what you might call the second class cities in the United States.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What about the cost of living in Montreal as compared with some of the large cities in the United States?—A. The cost of living is lower in the cities as they become smaller—on the average

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. The cost of living would be much lower in Montreal than in a city of corresponding size in the United States?—A. I would think there would not be much difference. I think that in Montreal and Toronto living is much cheaper than in New York. On the other hand, living in Winnipeg might cost as much as in one of the large cities in the United States.

Q. Have you any information as to how far the supplementary allowance for wives and children has been adopted?—A. The statistics are not very complete. Some one in the United States prepared some figures. I had better go a little further and state that the investigation in the United States in 1918, by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, showed the number of households where the head of the household contributed most of the income. I do not remember the figures. It has been said that they are not typical because the fourteen thousand families were selected. In addition, it was an abnormal time, 1918; it was not a normal year in any sense so that the statistics are not of very much value.

Q. Do you consider it fair—I am asking you to answer this from your reading in connection with the matter—do you consider it fair that the individual industry should have to bear the burden of the up-keep of a family?—A. For instance, the railroad industry in Canada.

Q. Any one industry?—A. I mentioned the railroad industry on purpose. Suppose that you adopted a minimum wage in Canada, for railroads, such as they proposed in Australia, and you made the minimum wage fifty cents an hour. Labor is only getting thirty-eight cents an hour. Suppose you made the minimum fifty cents an hour, and raised all the other classes correspondingly, you would cause an immense increase in the wage bill of the railways, and

obviously the Canadian National Railways would have a huge deficit, which would be passed on to the Dominion Treasury.

Mr. BELL: And passed on to us?

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. That is hardly the point I am dealing with. When a man is giving service to the railways, or in any other industry, and he is married, is his service any better for his being married? If he is paid in accordance with the cost of the upkeep of his family, he might need two or three times as much as the single man needs. Should the railroad be taxed with the larger sum needed to keep his family?—A. That is a question of policy that I would not like to speak about. I have not any information on that point.

The CHAIRMAN: When an individual industry could not pay that man the wage required, he would simply have to shift from one industry to another; he would have to locate himself?

The WITNESS: I can give you an answer second hand, if you like. One of the staff of the Commissioner of Labor Statistics in the United States, in giving evidence, stated that the industry that could not do so should not be allowed to exist.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. There was a book published in England by Rathbone touching on that particular question, and it was shown that in France and in other countries they are actually working on that basis; they are paying men according to the size of the family.—A. The International Labor Bureau issued a book on it, and Paul Douglas contributed a large part of that book. He also wrote a book of his own on the wages and the family, from which I quoted, telling about that and discussing the principles of it in a different way from what he did in the other book.

Q. Is that not the very thing that Mr. Woodsworth is driving at now—the question of whether a man with seven or eight of a family should not have a larger allowance than a man with three or four of a family?—A. In Australia, when the proposal of the basic wage was considered there was a proposal to adopt a system of family allowances, that is a minimum wage for a man without a family and a supplementary allowance for a man with a wife and children.

Q. Was that to be paid by the State or by the employer?—A. In Australia, it was not done. In Europe it is chiefly paid by the employer.

The CHAIRMAN: There would come a stage when the maximum wages would reach a point when the employer could not expand any further in regard to wages. What is going to happen then? The industry must either go out of business, or the man must move to another industry.

The WITNESS: In Europe it is said it is cheaper than raising wages.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Should that not be a consideration in making up the family budget?—A. I got a clipping this morning stating that in Germany, where the system of family allowances had become very extensive, it is declining and going out of use. In Germany, when the money went to pieces, the difference between the cost of living and wages was very marked, more so than in any other country in the world, and this system of family allowances was one device they had to help conditions. It is quite common in France yet. As conditions get more normal, this device is used less and less. Whether it will disappear or continue to be adopted, I do not know.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Would it be possible, not this morning, but on another occasion, to show us something in the nature of what a worker actually receives here in Canada in

wages, and what you might call the minimum subsistence budget, that is similar to the one you described—what you might call a "comfort" budget for a man with $2,400 a year? If I remember correctly, the figures issued by one of the Departments show that the average wages earned by railroad workers here in Canada, including the salaries of all the higher officials, Sir Henry Thornton and Mr. Beatty, worked out at about fifty seven and two-thirds cents per hour, taking all the higher scale and the higher paid men on the railway. That is the average wage of the railway employee here in the Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that include the Departmental heads?

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, all of them.

The WITNESS: The report shows the total number of hours worked and the total wages paid, and if you divide the total number of hours and divide the amount of wages, you will get the average rate per hour.

Mr. HEAPS: Fifty seven and two-thirds cents is paid according to the Bureau of Statistics. That is the rate of pay actually earned by the railroad workers, but it does not give the actual number of hours worked. If the employee worked forty hours a week—

The WITNESS: Does not the report show the total number of hours?

Mr. HEAPS: I think you will find that forty hours is the average week. In some cases it may be a little difficult, because you have employers paying employees there who do not show the number of hours, but say it is 40 hours per week at 57¾ cents per hour, it would amount to about $22.80 per week as the average pay of the railway employees, including the highest paid workers, in the railroad systems. I would like that worked out in conjunction with the family budget in Canada.

The WITNESS: Of course, that large number of railway workers includes the section men who live out in the country, and there are no statistics for the cost of living in rural places.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Their cost of living would not be so high. .

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. And the cost of living of other men such as men employed on the railroad, whose wages are around 32½ to 35 cents an hour?—A. That report shows them in groups, but you could pick out two of the groups; for instance, the shop men and the shop labourers.

Q. You could pick out which ever you wish, so as to give you something which would be a fair index of the cost of living for the Canadian workers on the railroad.—A. You would find that the highest class of railway workers would be getting $2,400 a year—$200 a month.

Q. Very few get that.—A. It is for conductors and engineers, commonly suposed to be living in wealth, who are averaging around $200 a month.

Q. I think it works out a little over $1 an hour.—A. Yes, and for skilled shop men who get 70 cents an hour,—I don't believe they would average anything like $1,400 a year, allowing for unemployment. Then you get some classes who get $175 a month, and there are a great lot of railway employees who come under your "Health and Subsistence" budget—around $1,600 a year. You would find many labourers would average around $1,000; some of them $900, and some of them $800. These live on the poverty level.

Q. Could you take and work out a family budget in Canada so we would have something concrete?—A. I could work out something along this line.

Q Take the large centres like Montreal, Winnipeg, and Vancouver; for railway shopmen in those centres, and take the three large groups which they represent.—A. Do you want to take their full time earnings, or their actual earnings?

Q. Actual earnings.—A. Yes.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Would you read to us, or give us a paper showing what you regard as the items which should be included in a "Health and Decency" budget?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want that given now?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Given now, or included in his statement.

The WITNESS: The items are about the same in all budgets. The difference is in the quantity. Most of these budgets are confined to the necessities of life, and the difference between the "Poverty" budget and the "Comfort" budget would be in the quantity and quality of goods. For instance, in the "Comfort" budget you could put in a good grade of meat, while in the "Poverty" budget you would have to cut that out.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. Is there anything under the head "Miscellaneous" you could cut out? —A. Yes, when you come to vegetables. It is impossible to calculate the prices of lettuce and asparagus and celery, and so on.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Could we have a sample budget given us showing these items?—A. We generally take the prices of cabbage or potatoes or some such standard vegetable and allow from 20 per cent to 30 per cent for the others; the same with the meats.

By the Chairman:

Q. We could get one of these sample budgets, could we not?—A. There are a good many of them. I have seen a good many of them, one way and another.

Q. In your opinion— —A. Which of Paul Douglas' budgets do you want it on?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would suggest the "Health and Decency"; if you could include there what items composed that budget, we might judge then whether it seems to be reasonable.

The WITNESS: There is a budget on that level for Canada. Arthur Martell worked a budget out which cost about $1,600.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What year was that?—A. He published it without the prices. He also published one with the prices. I meant to bring it here today, but I took it home, and must have left it there by mistake. I think it was in 1921 or 1922.

Q. There would be some change in the cost of living?—A. Very little since 1922.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have had a lot of talk about prices and so on, and I would ask Mr. Bolton to bring what he regards—from whatever source he likes—as a reasonable "Health and Decency" budget.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the Number three that he was discussing?

The WITNESS: That budget is the easiest to make, because it corresponds roughly to the average skilled workingman's living. You see, a carpenter who gets 75 cents an hour, and has steady work, will make about that in a year, while street railway conductors and motormen, who have steady work and considerable overtime, will get about $1,600 a year. They get about 50 cents an hour, but they get a fair lot of overtime.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I want you to forget the wages of to-day.

The WITNESS: Yes, but you have to make them agree to living conditions of some class of person for a budget of $1,600. For school teachers or professional persons, it would be entirely different than for workingmen.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. Is there anything taken into account in this calculation that would cover the condition of the unskilled men who are at the mercy of anyone who employs them, to a large extent?—A. A man out of work?

Q. Well, take the class of labour he performs; it is probably all due to the class of work he is doing, and the character of the man who is employing him; he is in his hands to some extent, as to the treatment he gets.—A. The labourers in the building trades, or something like that?

Q. Well, not so much that. Take the class of men—in my own county there are men who, I am frank to say, I cannot see how they exist, and I am just wondering whether that enters into the preparation of a budget.—A. The majority of these men are living on what Paul Douglas calls a "Poverty" level.

Q. I know cases where they are getting 25 cents an hour, and if they work 8 hours they get $2.00 a day.—A. They generally work ten hours if they get 25 cents an hour.

Mr. BELL (St. John): Well, that is $2.50.

Mr. HEAPS: Mr. Chairman, the time is getting on, and I want to know exactly what information we will have submitted to us. Mr. Woodsworth has asked for certain information, and I have asked for certain information, and it would help me considerably in the matter I am trying to reach if I could have the information I asked for from Mr. Bolton. I think it should be understood before we adjourn as to the exact information we may expect from Mr. Bolton.

The CHAIRMAN: And about what time we would be able to get it.

Mr. HEAPS: Just what we will get is what I want to know. I would like to have the three budgets, the minimum—the lowest form of subsistence—and then the next, and then the third, which is called the "Comfort" budget.

The WITNESS: And leave the poverty level out?

Mr. HEAPS: Whatever budgets Mr. Douglas had; we might try to have the same here on the same basis.

The WITNESS: You don't want his poverty level budget, because you cannot live on it.

Mr. HEAPS: I want to show, if we can get it, what the poverty level budget is, and to show what the actual earnings are. I want to make this comparison, because we have an idea of what the average wages are in Canada, for people employed in this country. As published by the Bureau of Statistics, it shows it to be about $930 or $940, for the last year. Now, we have some idea of what we desire in Canada, and we want an idea of what his subsistence living would cost, the highest, and so on. I don't think I am asking too much.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can you give us that, Mr. Bolton?—A. I can give you that.

Witness retired.

The committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 18, 1926, at 11.00 a.m.

APPENDIX TO EVIDENCE OF C. W. BOLTON

ANNUAL EARNINGS OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IN CANADA, 1924

May 11, 1926.

The annual report by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on Steam Railways in Canada for the year 1924, shows the number of employees in the various classes of employees, the total number of hours worked during the year, the total wages paid and the average earnings per hour.

From these figures the accompanying table has been calculated to show the average earnings for certain classes of employees.

It will be observed that sectionmen average about $900 per year, machinists about $1,500, telegraphers $1,743 and all classes $1,411 for the year. Several classes of train and engine service employees average about $2,400 per year or over.

Two family budgets are attached, the one of the " minimum subsistence " level at $1,400 per year and the other of the " health and decency " level defined by Professor Paul Douglas in his book " Wages and the Family ". The budgets for the $900 level and the $2,400 level have not been completed.

AVERAGE WORKING TIME AND WAGES PER YEAR OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND OF ALL CLASSES, INCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS, ETC.

—	Average hours worked per year*	Average earnings per hour	Average earnings per year
		$	$
Telegraphers, etc	2,530	689	1,743
Road Freight Conductors	2,925	864	2,527
" " Brakemen	2,746	672	1,845
" Passenger Engineers, etc	2,434	1,335	3,249
" " Firemen	2,386	1,003	2,393
" " Conductors	2,599	1,049	2,726
Clerks	2,424	570	1,382
Machinists	2,040	736	1,501
Sectionmen	2,469	365	901
All Classes	2,446	577	1,411

*Ascertained by dividing total hours worked by number of men employed.

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,400.00

Foods

Item	Quantity per year	Price	Cost per year
		$ c.	$ c.
Meats and Fish—			
Beef, sirloin steak	50 lb.	0 30	15 00
Beef, round steak	50 "	0 25	12 50
Beef, rib roast	50 "	0 20	10 00
Beef, shoulder roast	50 "	0 15	7 50
Beef, stewing meat	50 "	0 15	7 50
Veal, roast, forequarter	10 "	0 20	2 00
Mutton, leg roast	25 "	0 30	7 50
Lamb	10 "	0 35	3 50
Pork, fresh, ham	25 "	0 30	7 50
Pork, fresh, chops	25 "	0 35	8 75
Pork, salt, mess	10 "	0 25	2 50
Bacon, breakfast	25 "	0 40	10 00
Ham, smoked	25 "	0 50	12 50

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,400.00—*Continued*

FOODS—*Continued*

Item	Quantity per year	Price	Cost per year
		$ c.	$ c.
MEATS AND FISH—*Conc.*			
Fish, fresh	25 "	0 20	5 00
Fish, frozen	10 "	0 20	2 00
Fish, boneless cod	10 "	0 20	2 00
Fish, salt, herring	5 doz.	0 65	3 25
Fish, smoked, haddie, etc	5 lb.	0 20	1 00
Fish, canned salmon	10 "	0 35	3 50
Other meats, fish, etc			2 50
Total			126 00
DAIRY PRODUCTS, ETC.—			
Butter, dairy	75 lb.	0 45	33 75
Butter, creamery	75 "	0 50	37 50
Cheese	10 "	0 33	3 30
Milk	730 "	0 12	87 60
Eggs, fresh	50 doz.	0 45	22 50
Eggs, cooking	25 "	0 35	8 75
Lard	25 lb.	0 25	6 25
Total			199 65
BREAD, CEREALS, ETC.—			
Bread, white, standard	500 lb.	0 07	35 00
Soda biscuits	25 "	0 20	5 00
Flour, white, standard	100 "	0 05	5 00
Flour, whole wheat, etc	50 "	0 05	2 50
Oatmeal and Rolled Oats	50 "	0 05	2 50
Cornmeal	25 "	0 05	1 25
Rice	10 "	0 10	1 00
Tapioca	5 "	0 10	0 50
Sago	2 "	0 10	0 20
Barley, pearl	5 "	0 10	0 50
Total			53 45
VEGETABLES—			
Potatoes	8 bags	2 00	16 00
Beans, dry	10 lb.	0 08	0 80
Turnips	1 bu.	0 50	0 50
Carrots	1 pk.	0 75	0 75
Beets	1 pk.	0 75	0 75
Cabbage	12 head	0 05–0 10	0 90
Onions	25 lb.	0 15	3 75
Corn, canned	12 cans	0 15	1 80
Peas, canned	12 "	0 18	2 16
Tomatoes, canned	12 "	0 16	1 92
Beans	12 "	0 25	3 00
Sundries	10 per cent		3 25
Total			35 58
FRUITS—			
Apples, in pecks or bushels	2 bu.	2 00	4 00
Apples, in doz., lb. or gal	8 gal.	0 25	2 00
Evaporated apples	10 lb.	0 20	2 00
Prunes	10 "	0 15	1 50
Raisins	15 "	0 18	2 70
Currants	10 "	0 18	1 80
Jam, raspberry, etc	15 "	0 22	3 30
Fruit, canned, peaches, etc	25 cans	0 30	7 50
Sundries, fresh, for canning, etc	25 per cent		6 25
Total			31 05

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,400.00—*Continued*

FOODS—*Concluded*

Item	Quantity per year	Price	Cost per year
		$ c.	$ c.
SUGAR, ETC.—			
Sugar, granulated	200 lb.	0 08	16 00
Sugar, yellow	50 "	0 07½	3 75
Molasses	½ gal.	0 90	0 45
Corn syrup	2 lb.	0 12½	0 50
Honey, 5 lb. pail, etc	5 "	0 25	1 25
Total			21 95
TEA, ETC.—			
Tea, black	13 lb.	0 55	7 15
Tea, green	13 "	0 60	7 80
Coffee	5 "	0 50	2 50
Cocoa	1 "	0 25	0 25
Total			17 70
CONDIMENTS, ETC.—			
Vinegar	1 gal.	0 50	0 50
Salt	10 lb.	0 04	0 40
Pepper	½ "	0 50	0 25
Cream of tartar	4 "	0 60	2 40
Baking soda	2 "	0 10	0 20
Spices, extracts, etc	10 per cent		0 40
Total			4 15

FUEL AND LIGHT

Coal, anthracite	5 tons	18 00	90 00
Coal, bituminous	½ ton	10 00	5 00
Wood, hard	½ cord	12 00	6 00
Wood, soft	½ cord	10 00	5 00
Coal oil	1 gal.	0 30	0 30
Electric light and gas			12 00
Lamps and electric supplies			0 75
Total			119 05

CLOTHING

MAN—			
Overcoat	½	20 00	10 00
Raincoat	1/5	10 00	2 00
Suit	½	25 00	12 50
Trousers	1 pair	4 00	4 00
Sweater coat	½	2 50	1 25
Overalls	2 pairs	2 00	4 00
Working shirt	2	1 50	3 00
Working jacket	1	2 00	2 00
Socks, heavy mixed, etc	4 pairs	0 65	2 60
Socks, light cashmere, etc	2 "	0 60	1 20
Socks, light cotton, etc	2 "	0 35	0 70
Underwear, winter	1 suit	3 00	3 00
Underwear, summer	1 "	1 50	1 50
Nightshirts	1	1 50	1 50
Shirt, white, etc	2	1 50	3 00
Boots, working	2 pairs	4 00	8 00
Boots, street	1 pair	6 50	6 50
Rubbers	1 "	1 25	1 25
Hat, felt	½	4 00	2 00
Cap, street	½	1 50	0 75

[Mr. C. W. Bolton.]

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,400.00—*Continued*

CLOTHING—*Continued*

Item	Quantity per year	Price	Cost per year
		$ c.	$ c.
MAN—*Conc.*			
Cap, working	1	0 50	0 50
Gloves, working	1 pair	1 75	1 75
Gloves, woollen or lined	½ "	1 50	0 75
Mitts	1 "	0 75	0 75
Collars	6	0 25	1 50
Handkerchiefs	6	0 15	0 90
Sundries	5 per cent		3 75
Total			80 65
WOMAN—			
Coat	½	20 00	10 00
Raincoat	1 5	10 00	2 00
Suit	½	30 00	15 00
Waist	2	1 25	2 50
Skirt	1	4 00	4 00
Underskirt, coloured	1	2 50	2 50
Underskirt, white	1	1 25	1 25
Wash dresses	2	1 50	3 00
Aprons, materials	5 yd.	0 25	1 25
Corset	1	1 75	1 75
Stockings, winter	4 pairs	0 75	3 00
Stockings, summer	2 "	0 65	1 30
Underwear, winter	1 suit	1 50	1 50
Underwear, summer	1 "	1 00	1 00
Nightgowns, flannel materials	3 yd.	0 35	1 05
Nightgowns, cotton materials	3 "	0 30	0 90
Boots	1 pair	6 00	6 00
Shoes	1 "	4 00	4 00
Slippers	1 "	2 00	2 00
Rubbers	1 "	1 00	1 00
Hat, materials, etc			3 50
Gloves, woollen	1 pair	1 00	1 00
Gloves, light	1 "	1 25	1 25
Sundries	10 per cent		6 75
Total			77 50
BOY—11 TO 13 YEARS—			
Overcoat	½	12 00	6 00
Suit	1	12 00	12 00
Trousers, good	1 pair	2 50	2 50
Trousers, medium	1 "	1 50	1 50
Sweater coat	½	2 50	1 25
Sweater pullover	½	2 00	1 00
Stockings, winter	4 pairs	0 75	3 00
Stockings, summer	2 "	0 50	1 00
Underwear, winter	1 suit	2 00	2 00
Underwear, summer	1 "	1 50	1 50
Nightshirt	2	0 90	1 80
Boots, heavy	2 pairs	4 00	8 00
Boots, dress	1 pair	3 50	3 50
Cap, winter	1	0 60	0 60
Cap, summer	1	0 50	0 50
Mitts or gloves	1 pair	0 75	0 75
Shirts, white, etc	2	0 85	1 70
Collars	6	0 20	1 20
Sundries	5 per cent		2 60
Total			52 40

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,400.00—*Concluded*

CLOTHING—*Concluded*

Item	Quantity per year	Prices	Cost per year
		$ c.	$ c.
GIRL—7-10 Years—			
Coat	1	8 00	8 00
Dress, winter	2	2 50	5 00
Dress, summer	1	1 75	1 75
Dress materials	6 yd.*	0 30	1 80
Sweater coats	½	4 00	2 00
Underskirts, coloured material	1½ yd.	0 35	0 53
Underskirts, white material	1½ yd.	0 30	0 45
Aprons, material	3 yd.	0 25	0 75
Stockings, winter	1 pair	0 75	0 75
Stockings, summer	1½ "	0 35	0 53
Underwear, winter	1 suit	1 50	1 50
Underwear, summer	1½ "	0 70	1 05
Nightgown, flannelette	2½ yd.	0 35	0 88
Nightgown, white, cotton material	2½ "	0 30	0 75
Underwaists	2	0 25	0 50
Boots	1 pair	4 00	4 00
Shoes	1 "	2 00	2 00
Rubbers	2 "	0 95	1 90
Hat, summer	1	1 50	1 50
Cap, winter	1	0 75	0 75
Sundries	5 per cent	.....	1 80
Total	.....	.....	38 19
*Dresses, gingham, etc.			
CHILD—4-6 Years—			
Coat	½	8 00	4 00
Dress or suit, winter	1	4 00	4 00
Dress, summer	2	1 00	2 00
Skirt or pants	2	0 75	1 50
Sweater	1	1 25	1 25
Underwaists	2	0 50	1 00
Stockings	4 pairs	0 35	1 40
Nightgowns, flannelette materials	1½ yd.	0 35	0 53
Nightgowns, cotton materials	1½ "	0 30	0 45
Boots	3 pairs	1 50	4 50
Rubbers	1 pair	0 90	0 90
Cap	1	0 50	0 50
Hat	1	0 75	0 75
Mittens or gloves	2 pairs	0 30	0 60
Sundries	5 per cent	.....	1 22
Total	.....	.....	24 60

SUMMARY

Items	Cost per year
	$ cts.
FOOD—	
Meats and fish	126 00
Dairy products, etc	199 65
Bread, cereals, etc	53 45
Vegetables	35 58
Fruits	31 05
Sugar, etc	21 95
Tea, etc	17 70
Condiments, etc	4 15
All	489 53

[Mr. C. W. Bolton.]

SUMMARY—*Concluded*

Items	Cost per year
	$ cts.
CLOTHING—	
Man	80 65
Woman	77 50
Boy (11-13)	52 40
Girl (7-10)	38 19
Child (4-6)	24 60
All	273 34
Fuel and light	119 05
Rent	240 00
MISCELLANEOUS—	
Furniture and furnishings	60 00
Health, dentist, etc	60 00
Insurance	40 00
Contributions, dues, etc	30 00
Education, reading, etc	20 00
Cleaning supplies, toilet articles, etc	30 00
Other items	35 00
All	275 00
GRAND TOTAL	1,396 92

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,750.00

FOODS

Item	Quantity per Year	Price	Cost per Year
		$ cts.	$ cts.
MEATS AND FISH—			
Beef, sirloin steak	50 lb.	0 30	15 00
Beef, round steak	50 "	0 25	12 50
Beef, rib roast	50 "	0 20	10 00
Beef, shoulder roast	50 "	0 15	7 50
Beef, stewing meat	25 "	0 15	3 75
Veal, roast, forequarter	10 "	0 20	2 00
Mutton, leg roast	25 "	0 30	7 50
Lamb	50 "	0 35	17 50
Pork, fresh, ham	25 "	0 30	7 50
Pork, fresh, chops	25 "	0 35	8 75
Pork, salt, mess	10 "	0 25	2 50
Bacon, breakfast	50 "	0 40	20 00
Ham, smoked	50 "	0 50	25 00
Fish, fresh	25 "	0 20	5 00
Fish, frozen	10 "	0 20	2 00
Fish, boneless cod	10 "	0 20	2 00
Fish, smoked, haddie, etc	10 "	0 20	2 00
Fish, canned, salmon	10 "	0 35	3 50
Other meats, fish, etc			2 50
Total			156 50
DAIRY PRODUCTS, ETC.—			
Butter, dairy	75 lb.	0 45	33 75
Butter, creamery	75 "	0 50	37 50
Cheese, old	10 "	0 33	3 30
Milk	730 qt.	0 12	87 60
Eggs, fresh	50 doz.	0 45	22 50
Eggs, cooking, etc	50 "	0 35	17 50
Lard	25 lb.	0 25	6 25
Total			208 40

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,750.00

FOODS—*Concluded*

Item	Quantity per Year	Price	Cost per Year
		$ cts.	$ cts.
BREAD, CEREALS, ETC.—			
Bread, white, standard	500 lb.	0 07	35 00
Soda biscuits	25 "	0 20	5 00
Flour, white, standard	100 "	0 05	5 00
Flour, whole wheat, etc	50 "	0 05	2 50
Oatmeal and rolled oats	50 "	0 05	2 50
Cornmeal	25 "	0 05	1 25
Rice	10 "	0 10	1 00
Tapioca	5 "	0 10	0 50
Sago	2 "	0 10	0 20
Barley, pearl	5 "	0 10	0 50
Total			53 45
VEGETABLES—			
Potatoes	8 bags	2 00	16 00
Beans, dry	10 lb.	0 08	0 80
Turnips	1 bush.	0 50	0 50
Carrots	1 pk.	0 75	0 75
Beets	1 pk.	0 75	0 75
Cabbage	12 head	0 05–0 10	0 90
Onions	25 lb.	0 15	3 75
Corn, canned	24 cans	0 15	3 60
Peas, canned	24 "	0 18	4 32
Tomatoes, canned	24 "	0 16	3 84
Beans	12 "	0 25	3 00
Sundries	10 per cent of above		4 00
Total			42 21
FRUITS—			
Apples, in pecks or bush	2 bush.	2 00	4 00
Apples, in doz., lb. or gal	8 gal.	0 25	2 00
Evaporated apples	10 lb.	0 20	2 00
Prunes	10 "	0 15	1 50
Raisins	15 "	0 18	2 70
Currants	10 "	0 18	1 80
Jam, raspberry, etc	25 "	0 22	5 50
Fruit, canned, peaches, etc	30 cans	0 30	9 00
Sundries, fresh, for canning, etc	25 per cent of above		7 00
Total			35 50
SUGAR, ETC.—			
Sugar, granulated	250 lb.	0 08	20 00
Sugar, yellow	50 "	0 07½	3 75
Molasses	3 gal.	0 90	2 70
Corn syrup	2 lb.	0 12½	0 50
Honey, 5 lb. pail, etc	10 "	0 25	2 50
Total			29 45
TEA, ETC.—			
Tea, black	13 lb.	0 55	7 15
Tea, green	13 "	0 60	7 80
Coffee	10 "	0 50	5 00
Cocoa	5 "	0 25	1 25
Total			21 20
CONDIMENTS, ETC.—			
Vinegar	1 gal.	0 50	0 50
Salt	10 lb.	0 04	0 40
Pepper	½ "	0 50	0 25
Cream of tartar	4 "	0 60	2 40
Baking soda	2 "	0 10	0 20
Spices, extracts, etc	20 per cent		1 00
Total			4 75

[Mr. C. W. Bolton.]

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,750.00

FUEL AND LIGHT

Item	Quantity per Year	Price	Cost per Year
		$ cts.	$ cts.
Coal, anthracite	6 tons	18 00	108 00
Coal, bituminous	1 ton	10 00	10 00
Wood, hard	½ cord	12 00	6 00
Wood, soft	1 "	10 00	10 00
Coal oil	1 gal.	0 30	0 30
Electric light and gas	.....	.....	12 00
Lamps and electric supplies	.....	.....	0 75
Total	.....	.....	147 05

CLOTHING

MAN—			
Overcoat	½	30 00	15 00
Raincoat	⅓	15 00	3 00
Suit	½	30 00	15 00
Trousers	1 pair	5 00	5 00
Sweater coat	½	2 50	1 25
Overalls	2 pairs	2 00	4 00
Working shirt	2	1 50	3 00
Working jacket	1	2 00	2 00
Socks, heavy mixed, etc	4 pairs	0 65	2 60
Socks, light cashmere, etc	2 "	0 60	1 20
Socks, light cotton, etc	2 "	0 35	0 70
Underwear, winter	1 suit	3 00	3 00
Underwear, summer	1 "	1 50	1 50
Nightshirts	1	1 50	1 50
Shirt, white, etc	2	1 50	3 00
Boots, working	2 pairs	4 00	8 00
Boots, street	1 pair	6 50	6 50
Rubbers	1 "	1 25	1 25
Hat, felt	½	4 00	2 00
Cap, street	½	1 50	0 75
Cap, working	1	0 50	0 50
Gloves, working	1 pair	1 75	1 75
Gloves, woollen or lined	½ "	1 50	0 75
Mitts	1 "	0 75	0 75
Collars	6	0 25	1 50
Handkerchiefs	6	0 15	0 90
Sundries	5 per cent	.....	4 25
Total	.....	.....	90 65
WOMAN—			
Coat	½	30 00	15 00
Raincoat	⅓	15 00	3 00
Suit	½	30 00	15 00
Waists	2	1 25	2 50
Skirts	1	4 00	4 00
Underskirt, coloured	1	2 50	2 50
Underskirt, white	1	1 25	1 25
Wash dresses	2	1 50	3 00
Aprons, materials	5 yds.	0 25	1 25
Corset	1	1 75	1 75
Stockings, winter	4 pairs	0 75	3 00
Stockings, summer	2 "	0 65	1 30
Underwear, winter	1	1 50	1 50
Underwear, summer	1	1 00	1 00
Nightgowns, flannel materials	3 yds.	0 35	1 05
Nightgowns, cotton materials	3 "	0 30	0 90
Boots	1 pair	7 00	7 00
Shoes	1 "	5 00	5 00
Slippers	1 "	3 00	3 00
Rubbers	1 "	1 00	1 00
Hat, materials, etc	.....	.....	5 00
Gloves, woollen	1 pair	1 00	1 00
Gloves, light	1 "	1 25	1 25
Sundries	20 per cent	.....	16 00
Total	.....	.....	97 25

YEARLY BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE FOR AN AVERAGE FAMILY OF FIVE WITH AN INCOME OF $1,750.00

CLOTHING *Concluded*

Item	Quantity per Year	Price	Cost per Year
		$ cts.	$ cts.
BOY—11 TO 13 YEARS—			
Overcoat	½	15 00	7 50
Suit	1	15 00	15 00
Trousers, good	1 pair	3 00	3 00
Trousers, medium	1 "	1 50	1 50
Sweater coat	½	2 50	1 25
Sweater pullover	½	2 00	1 00
Stockings, winter	4 pairs	0 75	3 00
Stockings, summer	2 "	0 50	1 00
Underwear, winter	1 suit	2 00	2 00
Underwear, summer	1 "	1 50	1 50
Nightshirt	2	0 90	1 80
Boots, heavy	2 pairs	4 00	8 00
Boots, dress	1 "	3 50	3 50
Cap, winter	1	0 60	0 60
Cap, summer	1	0 50	0 50
Mitts and gloves	1 pair	0 75	0 75
Shirts, white, etc	2	0 85	1 70
Collars	6	0 20	1 20
Sundries	10 per cent	.....	5 50
Total	.....	.....	60 30
GIRL—7 TO 10 YEARS—			
Coat	1	10 00	10 00
Dress, winter	2	3 00	6 00
Dress, summer	1	2 00	2 00
Dress materials	6 yds.*	0 30	1 80
Sweater coats	½	4 00	2 00
Underskirts, coloured material	1½ yds.	0 35	0 53
Underskirts, white material	1½ "	0 30	0 45
Aprons, material	3 yds.	0 25	0 75
Stockings, winter	1 pair	0 75	0 75
Stockings, summer	1½ pair	0 35	0 53
Underwear, winter	1 suit	1 50	1 50
Underwear, summer	1½ "	0 70	1 05
Nightgowns, flannelette	2½ yds.	0 35	0 88
Nightgowns, white, cotton materials	2½ "	0 30	0 75
Underwaists	2	0 25	0 50
Boots	1 pair	4 00	4 00
Shoes	1 "	2 00	2 00
Rubbers	2 "	0 95	1 90
Hat, summer	1	2 00	2 00
Cap, winter	1	1 00	1 00
Sundries	10 per cent	.....	4 00
Total	.....	.....	44 39
*Dresses, ginghams, etc.			
CHILD—4 TO 6 YEARS—			
Coat	½	10 00	5 00
Dress or suit, winter	1	5 00	5 00
Dress, summer	2	1 00	2 00
Skirt or pants	2	0 75	1 50
Sweater	1	1 25	1 25
Underwaists	2	0 50	1 00
Stockings	4 pairs	0 35	1 40
Nightgowns, flannelette material	1½ yds.	0 35	0 53
Nightgowns, cotton materials	1½ "	0 30	0 45
Boots	4 pairs	1 50	6 00
Rubbers	1	0 90	0 90
Cap	1	0 50	0 50
Hat	1	0 75	0 75
Mittens or gloves	2 pairs	0 30	0 60
Sundries	5 per cent	.....	1 25
Total	.....	.....	28 13

[Mr. C. W. Bolton.]

SUMMARY

Items	Cost per Year
	$ cts.
FOOD—	
Meats and fish	156 50
Dairy products, etc.	208 40
Bread, cereals, etc.	53 45
Vegetables	42 21
Fruits	35 50
Sugar, etc.	29 45
Tea, etc.	21 20
Condiments, etc.	4 75
	551 46
CLOTHING—	
Man	90 65
Woman	97 25
Boy—11 13	60 30
Girl—7–10	44 39
Child—4 6	28 13
	320 72
FUEL AND LIGHT	147 05
RENT	330 00
MISCELLANEOUS—	
Furniture and furnishings	100 00
Health, dentist, etc.	75 00
Insurance	50 00
Contributions, dues, etc.	35 00
Education, reading, etc.	25 00
Cleaning supplies, toilet articles, etc.	35 00
Other items	50 00
All	370 00
GRAND TOTAL	1,719 23

MEMORANDUM

CHANGES IN RATES OF WAGES AND COST OF LIVING IN GREAT BRITAIN SINCE 1900

In his book on "Poverty, A Study in Town Life," published in 1901, Mr. Seebohm Rowntree, giving the results of a study of living conditions among the poor in York, stated that 21s. was the minimum on which an average family (stated by him to be man, wife, and three dependent children) could live.

For 1914, in a book on "Human Needs of Labour," he estimated 35s. was the minimum for a family and 20s. for a single woman; a higher standard than he estimated for York in 1901 as the change in the cost of living was calculated by Mrs. Frances Wood to be in the period from 1900 to 1912 about seven per cent.

Statistics of wages and prices prior to 1914 were rather irregular. The accompanying table summarizes the available figures of a continuous nature, giving British Labour Department figures on wages and Mrs. Frances Wood's calculation of changes in the cost of living covering food and rent only, for the city of London. No official figures for more than food were available. The average increase in clothing, fuel, etc., was assumed to be about the same as for food and rent.

INDEX NUMBERS OF CHANGES IN THE COST OF LIVING IN GREAT BRITAIN
1914 AND 1920-1925

Date	Cost of living (a)	Wage rates (b)	"Real" wages (c)
July, 1914	100	100	100
Dec., 1920	269	276	99
Dec., 1921	199	223	121
Dec., 1922	180	178	102
Dec., 1993	177	173	99
June, 1924	169	179	105
Dec., 1924	181	179	99
June, 1925	172	181	105
Dec., 1925	177	181	102

(a) Index Number of the Ministry of Labour.

(b) International Labour Office: calculated from British official figures.

(c) Calculated from above by International Labour Office to show relative purchasing value of wages year to year as compared with 1914.

CHANGES IN THE COST OF LIVING AND IN WAGES, THE UNITED KINGDOM 1900–1923

Year	Index Number of cost of living, food and rent, London (1)	Minimum wage required in each year to equal 21s. in 1900	Index number of wages in United Kingdom (2)	Wages, average weekly earnings of employees on 27 principal railways (3)
		s. d.		s. d.
1900	100	21 ..	100	25 0¾
1901	100·3	21 ..	98·50	25 0½
1902	101·0	21 2	96·96	24 11¼
1903	101·2	21 3	96·21	24 10½
1904	101·8	21 4	95·56	25 0¼
1905	102·6	21 6	95·94	25 3½
1906	102·3	21 6	97·60	25 5
1907	102·1	21 4	101·79	25 9¾
1908	104·1	21 9	100·97	25 0
1909	104·8	22 ..	99·41	25 4¼
1910	105·2	22 ..	99·70	25 9
1911	105·8	22 2	99·83	26 8¼
1912	107·0	22 6	102·46	27 4½
1913	.....	.....	.....	27 11¼

(1) Mrs. Frances Wood, Royal Statistical Journal, December, 1913.

(2) Labour Department of Board of Trade; Building Trades, Coal Miners, Engineering Trades and Textile Trades.

(3) In 1913, wages in building trades ranged from 6d. per hour for labourers up to 8d. and 10d. for skilled workers such as carpenters and bricklayers respectively. At 48 hours per week the full time weekly earnings would be 24s. for labourers, 36s. for carpenters and 40s. for bricklayers.

[Mr. C. W. Bolton.]

INDEX NUMBERS OF RATES OF WAGES AND COST OF LIVING IN CANADA, 1901-1925

Year	Wages							Cost of living 60 cities; food, fuel, rent, clothing, sundries
	Building Trades	Metal Trades	Printing Trades	Electric Railways	Steam Railways	Coal Mining	Average	
1901	60·3	68·6	60 0	64·0	70·8	82·8	67·8	70
1902	64·2	70·2	61·6	68·0	73·6	83·8	70·2	.....
1903	67·4	73·3	62·6	71·1	76·7	85·3	72·7	.....
1904	69·7	75·9	66·1	73·1	78·6	85·1	74·8	.....
1905	73·0	78·6	68·5	73·5	78·9	86·3	76·5	79
1906	76·9	79·8	82·2	75·7	80·2	87·4	78·7	83
1907	80·2	82·4	78·4	81·4	85·5	93·6	83·6	90
1908	81·5	84·7	80·5	81·8	86·7	94·8	85·0	85
1909	83·1	86·2	83·4	81·1	86·7	95·1	85·9	86
1910	86·9	88·8	87·7	85·7	91·2	94·2	89·1	90
1911	90·2	91·0	91·6	88·1	96·4	97·5	92·5	91
1912	96·0	95·3	96·0	92·3	98·3	98·3	96·0	97
1913	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100
1914	100·8	100·5	102·4	101·0	101·7	101·9	101·4	102
1915	101·5	101·5	103·6	97·8	101·7	102·3	101·4	102
1916	102·4	106·9	105·8	102·2	100·9	111·7	105·7	110
1917	109·9	128·0	111·3	114·6	110·1	130·8	117·5	133
1918	125·9	155·2	123·7	142·9	133·2	157·8	139·8	154
1919	148·2	180·1	145·9	163·3	154·2	170·5	160·4	169
1920	180·9	209·4	184·0	194·2	186·6	197·7	192·1	195
1921	170·5	186·8	193·3	192·1	165·3	208·3	186·1	168
1922	162·5	173·7	192·3	184·4	155·1	197·8	176·8	153
1923	166·4	174·0	188·9	186·2	157·4	197·8	178·4	154
1924	169·7	175·5	191·9	186·4	157·4	192·4	179·3	152
1925	170·4	175·4	192·8	187·8	157·4	165·1	174·8	154

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, May 18, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. members will come to order, we will proceed. We have Miss Gould of the Research Department of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees with us this morning, and I presume it is the wish of the committee that we continue the evidence we were dealing with last week. I will ask Miss Gould to take the oath, and then we will just go on with the meeting.

MARGARET S. GOULD called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. Last week we had Mr. Bolton launch into his subject, and as he went along, we interrogated him, and unfolded the question before the committee. Will you proceed?—A. Mr. Chairman and members: I understand what you want this morning is a report of the investigation of the cost of living on the

basis of a family budget. In this regard, I am in rather a happy position because for the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees Research Department, for the past year I have been travelling from coast to coast in Canada, pricing the cost of living, but not in the way it has been done in Canada before. In order to arrive at the cost of living in Canada, we had to determine what standard of living should be the basis of our investigation. We know that standards of living are as wide in range as the incomes of groups of people. Sometimes, if you walk down the wards of the city you find some families trying to exist on a dollar a day, or fifty cents a day; on the other hand, you pick up the weekly paper and find where a debutante pays $6,000 to $12,000 for a coming-out party. I submit the living standards to-day depend on the amount of money available. So we had to determine what should be a reasonable basis from which we could find out what it costs a workman and his family to live.

Can we say that the standard of living should be in accordance with what people have to pay? There we had to go into a rather exhaustive and extensive study as to what other investigators found regarding living standards for a workman and his family. That took me, before I went out on the trip, into a reading course as to what other countries have done, and I found in my reading, first, that the family budgets I studied, or the studies of the cost of living, can be divided into three distinct groups. First, investigation that is carried out by governments. They can be dated back, perhaps, before the beginning of this century, but the intensive activities on the parts of governments really began during the war, when the cost of living rose so high, and changes in it had to be noted quickly; so that most governments made studies of the cost of living, and most of them, especially the United States, adopted the method of studying same, through the collection of family budgets; accounts from families as to what they earned, and what they spent, and through that, they were able to find out what people were spending on the items under examination. They had no interest in determining whether a family had a proper or decent standard of living, as we call it. They wanted simply to find out what the changes were in the prices of the items which they bought from time to time. Now, the second class is the study made by sociologists, primarily people who lived and worked in settlement houses—settlement houses in the United States and England are houses in the poorer sections of the cities, perhaps the poorest—and their object is to give these people better visions of what life can be. They have special grants for this purpose; and they have clubs for mothers and clubs for fathers, and for children, and they show them how they can live better. You probably all know of the wonderful work done by Jane Addams in Hull House, Chicago, in Toynbee Hall in England, by the East Side Settlement House in New York, and so forth. In Canada we have some excellent ones. Toronto has some very fine settlements that have done splendid work. Settlement workers were interested in the standards of living of the people among whom they worked, and they made most of the early cost of living studies. Mr. Chapin, a social worker in New York, Mrs. Moore on the west side of New York, Mr. Rowntree, who is not a social worker but a social investigator, has made a study of the poor in York, Eng.; Mr. Booth, who made a classical study of the poor in London, and others. Most of these studies were to find out how people lived, and what it cost them to live in their own fashion. From that, they gradually developed a standard of how people ought to live. From finding out how people lived, from taking a certain group of people who had a sufficient amount,—well, within their income, or within the area of the locality,—a sufficient amount of clothing and food and recreation and education, and so on—in short, the better class of family in that locality, was the guide or ideal standard for the people who had not as much money to live on. So, there was developed in time what

began to be called the "Minimum of Subsistence" or the "Minimum of Health," and later on, when studies began to be made more intensively, more carefully, these designations or these names for the different standards began to be compiled and more carefully selected. But the early one was the Minimum of Subsistence. Mr. Chapin in New York made in 1907 what is now considered a classic, and scientific study of the minimum of subsistence standard. At that time he called it the "Minimum of Health." He took from, I think, 1,000 families, their budgets; he appointed special investigators to visit these families and have them keep accounts, and he made classifications according to their income groups. The family that earned $600 a year he found did not have sufficient food, clothing, and so on; they had to get their coal and wood from the streets, from railway sidings, and so on; they had to get their clothing as gifts; they could not go in for recreation except what they could get for nothing; they did not live in houses that would favour their health, consequently ill-health was common with them. He found that a family who earned $900 or $1,000 had a sufficient amount of food and clothing; they did not have to go to charity for clothing; they had a certain amount of furniture which would make home a home, and not merely a house or a shelter; he found they could belong to societies and churches and labour unions, and keep in touch with their fellow-workmen; he found they could go to amusement places and pay for them, and be more dignified, and so he gave the standard which even to-day is used by many who want to price the cost of living on a minimum of subsistence basis. Then the war came. Up to the war, the scientific budgets such as those prepared by Mr. Chapin and Mr. Rowntree, were used to determine the cost of the minimum of subsistence standard of living in mining communities, among unskilled factory workers, and so on. There are many books written and compiled for reference on these studies. Mr. Nearing has a book called, I think, "Income and the Family"—in which it is pointed out statistically that according to these studies, many workers in the States do not have a subsistence level. Later on, when we come to the comparisons of the cost of living and wages, I can quote the figures in comparison. When the war came it was found that it was almost impossible to determine the standard of living according to the money cost. Money flew out of all proportion as a means. For instance, sugar was five cents a pound, and when it went to ten cents a pound, it didn't mean anything. The determination of the cost of living, or the standard of living in terms of money, was almost impossible, and those who made further cost of living studies began to figure it differently. They began to ask "What is it a family needs in order to live?" not, how much money does a family need in order to live? What are the human requirements, and not the money requirements; and cost of living studies began to be made on a totally different scale. The quantity budget came in, which shows there are certain fundamental things a human being needs—food, clothing, and shelter. There are other needs which a human being who lives in a cultured or civilized society has. For instance, besides clothes, food and shelter, there is education, medical attendance, life insurance, savings, recreation, and all the rest. How much does a family need in order to really take its place in a civilized community? I suppose at first sight it seems to a lot of people impossible to determine or measure what a human being ought to have. People think that it is not possible to measure style, for instance; that it is not possible to measure what kind of a house a person ought to live in; that it is not possible to measure what kind of a menu a person ought to have. That is not true. There is a great deal of science in the measurement of human requirements, and in the arrangement of the details.

Physiologists to-day can tell us quite accurately, without any vagueness at all, what the human body requires in order to have the proper nourishment,

*Miss Margaret S. Gould.]

in order to build up a better body, according to age, according to sex, and so on. Dietitians can inform us quite accurately in regard to food for the body.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Taking into consideration the health of the individual?—A. Yes.

Q. You must have had a perfectly healthy patient before you began to figure it. —A. Yes. Experiments are being made, and can be made, according to health condition. Tubercular people require more food and rest, than a healthy person, so you can make your deductions or measurements quite accurately—in fact, without any mistakes whatever. That is, apart from the menu. You might have a dinner at the Chateau Laurier and a dinner at home, and the dinner at the Chateau will have certain kinds of meat and vegetables and desserts, while the dinner at home might have different kinds, and yet they would both be ample, and when you analyzed them you would find that each had, perhaps not the same, but specific caloric conditions, to meet the requirements of the individual. That is, there is no difference in the value of the food, but there may be in the choice of its kind, and we have a wealth of productions from which people can satisfy their individual tastes. We know how much food a human being ought to have in order to maintain himself in health, and in efficiency, and for the prolongation of life. Then we come to the realm of clothing—

Q. How did you arrive at that?—A. It was arrived at by the dietitians and physiologists—

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. You will come to that?—A. Well, I think I will come to it when I discuss the report we are using. Now we come to the realm of clothing, and people will say "You have a huge area of style; how can you choose what a person ought to have?". That may be. There is a dress that costs $15 and there is a dress that costs $300, and the $15 dress may be for the same occasion, according to the section you live in, but there are fundamental requirements in clothing. The human body must have warmth; the human body must be clothed according to the culture we live in, or the society or the country in which we live. Such things as temperature, call for particular clothing. You must have conventional decency; you cannot go around in a gauze dress or with shoes and no stockings, or stockings and no shoes, in the winter time, nor can you do so among people who are used to shoes. You cannot go around with a lot of clothes on in Africa, for instance; so you must have the clothing which gives you the requirements of your temperature and your country, and the requirements of the society and the conventions of the time in which you live. I don't think that can be gainsaid. It was on that basis that we made our calculations.

Then we come to housing, and here I think there is very little disagreement to-day. Housing experts, architects, building laws, and so on, combine to know what is healthy. We have prohibitive laws and we have instructive laws; we have laws which say you cannot have a house built in a certain way, and there are laws which say you must have your house built in a certain way. All a question of health. Families must have at least four or five rooms; they must have air, and light, ventilation, sanitation, cleanliness; there must be a decent separation of the sexes and there must be decent privacy for the family. Now, as to the question of decency: there may be a debate as to what we mean by it, but I think fundamentally, civilized people do agree on what is decent and what is not, on what is healthy and what is unhealthy. There is no disagreement as to the requirements of houses. The modern laws tell us what is the basis of health. We know how to distinguish between a house in the slums and a house which is not in the slums, because we have our basic principles to go on.

Then we come to the fourth item, which is sometimes called "sundries" and sometimes called "miscellaneous". In that fourth item are the things around which really centre the difference between a person living in a civilized community, living under a real, healthy, and decent standard, and persons who live from hand to mouth, or on a very much lower scale. There is the question of furnishings in the home. When you go into a very poor home, you know these people are not living in a respectable state; although they may be, according to their standards, or which you have seen in other such places. There are certain kinds of furniture they ought to have; there are certain kinds of household utensils a housewife must have if she is going to make a house a home; there are certain kinds of sundry items such as pictures, rugs and so on, and as far as I found, there is no disagreement among any one as to what the minimum requirements ought to be to turn a shelter into a home. That is the real difference between the caves and the homes of to-day. It is what goes into the home and what people make of it that makes the home. Then there are the other requirements which we find are necessary to-day—as necessary as food; those are medical attention, life insurance, insuring your belongings, recreation which is fundamentally quoted by those I have read as paramount in importance to food and clothing. "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy". You cannot go through life without playing, and playing costs money. There is a certain variation in that, almost as much as in clothing. You might spend an evening at home, and it would not cost you any money, and you would get more enjoyment out of it than at a big ball at the Chateau, which you had to pay $50 for. But there are certain fundamentals connected with recreation and amusement which can be agreed upon in this country.

That is the basis upon which budget makers and budget students placed themselves when they begin to study as to what ought to be a family budget, or what ought to be the cost of living for a family during and after the war. It was made easy, as I say, in two or three ways; first, because so many cost of living studies had been made by sociologists, showing income groups, and the needs of the people; it was therefore easy enough to calculate, with the help of dietitians, statisticians, physiologists, sociologists, and people who work among families, as to what ought to be a minimum basis. In 1918, on this continent, the United States carried out a stupendous undertaking. They made an investigation into the cost of living in 92 localities, covering 13,000 families. They took only the families of wage earners, both industrial and clerical; not those who were in business for themselves, and not those who had their living either from private income or in any other way but industry. They included all incomes in the family. Are you interested in the basis on which they made the studies?

Mr. McMillan: Oh yes.

The Witness: Yes; I think it would be rather to the point. The family must be that of a wage-earner or salaried worker, and not in business for himself. These families were representative of wage earners, and a lot of minimum salaried workers in that locality. The family must have as a minimum a husband and wife, and at least one child who is not a lodger or boarder. The family must keep house, and at least 75 per cent of the family's income must come from the bread-winner or others who contribute all the earnings to the family's fund. The family must not have a boarder nor over three lodgers. The family must have no subrental other than furnished rooms for lodgers. They took a compact family group, in which the father was the bread-winner. They sent out over three hundred agents over the country, and collected the budgets, the household accounts kept by these families for over a year. When they received that data, it was classified according to income groups; $900,

$1,000, $1,200, $1,500, $2,000 and up to $2,500. From these income groups they were able to determine, according to what the family used and bought, whether these families had sufficient food, sufficient clothing, decent housing, and a minimum of sundries necessary to live in a civilized community. With the help of dietitians, with the help of physiologists, with the help of family experts and statisticians, they were able to divide them up, and say that people below $1,400 or $1,500—this was in 1918, with the prices prevailing at that time—did not have sufficient food, or clothing necessary for decency, or the type of houses that they required to live in with decency, or the proper amount of essential sundries. From $1,500 to $2,100 these families did have sufficient clothing, sufficient food, and so on. They chose 288 families from which the dietitians were able to build up a food average consistent with the caloric needs of the human being. These families earned from $1,500 to $2,100 per year. This was done with every group, and upon this basis they were able to construct a most comprehensive budget which they called the "Minimum Budget Necessary for a Worker's Family of Five." In that they gave the amount of food necessary for instance, not only as to the requirements in calories, but also in food values, and at the same time, gave an opportunity for the balancing of food, the balancing of menus, and the correct proportion of every requirement in sugars, vegetables and fruits, and so on. They did likewise with clothing, and divided the budget into the seasons, for a husband and wife and three children. I could give you those statistics later on.

Mr. McMillan: I think we got that pretty well last time.

The Witness: All right, we will exclude that. For a family of five, the father, the mother, a boy of 12, a girl of 6, and a boy of 2. They did that with house furnishings; from the people who received $1,500 to $2,500 a year, they determined what ought to be a decent amount of furnishings in the home for a family of five, namely for a living room, dining room, two bedrooms, and a kitchen. These are the minimum requirements. From these also they determined what ought to be the minimum expenditure for medical care, dentists, oculists, medicines, and so on.

Mr. Hamilton: They would not have any wages left after that.

Mr. McMillan: It depends on what they got in the first place.

The Witness: We can discuss that later. I must point out that I think you are getting the idea that this is a theoretical budget. It is not. It is a budget of what people were actually using, and what they were paying for at that time; as to what it would cost in different parts of the country, was found when later repriced at different times of the year. They thus built up the quantity budget, as I said. This is what people ought to have; it is not an ideal budget; it is merely a necessary budget; it is not what people cannot improve upon; it is the bottom level that a family ought to have in order that they do not place themselves in danger of physical and moral deterioration. That was the assumption; and that was not only the assumption, but it was the proof. I think if we took the trouble to read many, many of the books—and I have read some—that show the ill effects of the insufficiency of income, you would see just what it means not to have sufficient food, etc. Fortunately, I may say, I did have occasion to see that often in practice. For some time before I went into research and cost of living work, I was a social worker in the city of Toronto, and had charge of a Family Welfare Department, which took care of all parts of the city. Toronto is a typical industrial city in Canada, perhaps the most typical,—together with Montreal. It is an industrial city and workers live there to a great extent. There are typical working class sections and typical poverty sections. The social worker sees the poverty sections, because she is in a position where she has to deal with those who are down and out, who somehow have

lost or missed their step in the race for decent living. I found in hundreds of cases which came under my care, and that of my assistants, that there was a tremendous connection, a most vital connection between the amount of wages received in a family, and the effect on that family if wages are not enough to buy the things they need. I found that 50 per cent of the cases which came for charity were those who were ill, and when I took the trouble to make a digest, in most of my families, I found the cause of that illness was not enough food, and bad housing. Most of my cases were tubercular, and were undernourished, and we all know that many ills come from undernourishment.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. What proportion of these were found to be intemperate?—A. I would say that very few of them, comparatively, were intemperate. Mr. Epstein has written a book entitled "Facing Old Age." He was Chairman of the Pennsylvania Commission on Old Age Pensions, and he made an exhaustive study as to why people are poor when they reach old age, and he found that among all the classifications, only five per cent of poverty in old age was due to imprudence or intemperance. That is not a case of guesswork; it is a case of laborious statistical research. In my own experience, which is only one of many in the country, I found that most of my families were in ill-health or poverty because they never had enough to live on throughout the time they were working or living. A lot of ill-health was due to occupational diseases. I had one carpenter, for instance, who had blood-poisoning. He was compelled to work at every available opportunity, and was not in a position where he could take a rest. If he had had enough leisure and sufficient air, with a decent house to live in,—he lived in a hovel because he had six children, and earned $18 a week—if he had been able to go away annually for a few weeks he might have headed off the disease which finally resulted in his death, the widowhood of his wife, and the orphaning of his children. There is a tremendous connection between the amount of wages, and the kind of food and sufficiency of food, the kind of housing, and the proper housing of a family. Some time ago a study was made by an organization in the States, which pointed out a very close connection between child mortality and insufficient or low wages, and maternal mortality and low wages. There are two most important points with regard to poverty,—insufficiency of food, and improper housing. Of course, improper clothing comes in too, because if you are not sufficiently warmly clad in the winter time, you are susceptible to pneumonia, bronchitis, and you have neglected colds which result in tuberculosis—

Discussion followed.

The Witness: (Continuing) Another type of family which fell into poverty are those which are unemployed a good deal of the time. So that you might say that three-fourths of the poor families are suffering the ill effects of poverty simply because they never earn enough to make a sufficient living, and to keep themselves in health. Now, I put this forward last to explain that there is no vagueness at all in the minds of those who are making a scientific study of family requirements and family budgets, as to what a family physically needs in order to maintain itself on the level of physical efficiency, and conventional decency. If you will allow me I will go on to show how we applied this to our investigation in Canada.

The Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees were interested for many reasons; one of them in establishing a standard for their own employees, and it may be of use to others who care to learn by what they have gained. We found there was very little in Canada upon which we could go in finding what the cost

of living is, or ought to be. Canada has not launched into a study of family budgets such as the United States has, for instance. In this respect the United States stands out as the most active, and the one who has established from authentic sources a method of making these studies. This is being used not only by social workers and organizations, in the United States, but was used also in the Australian investigation. I think I am not mistaken when I say that in reading the records of the Australian Commission on the basic wage, they say they were guided very closely in making their own investigation by the standard set by the United States investigation of 1918; so that the basic requirements of the family as set down by this 1918 investigation, are now more or less authoritative, as far as a study of this nature can be, since it is not ideal, but merely a rock-bottom level. Not finding sufficient ground to go on in Canada, we had to choose elsewhere and we found that, the most fundamental, the most satisfactory and the most comprehensive was that set by the 1918 investigation in the United States; that is to say, the minimum health and decency budget necessary for a worker's family of five. This budget has many qualities and necessary quantities of food. They are of the kind that can be found in any section of the country most of the year round. And most of our products are very much standardized; whether in food, clothing or housing. We made certain modifications for climatic needs; for instance, warm clothing and more food in the west, and less in the east, and we had to add to the Canadian budget a cookstove, for either coal or wood, because the American budget left that out. Why, I don't know. I suppose they left a lot of modifications to be made by the investigators, according to the locality in which the investigation was made. We had very little modification to make in the classes of food, such as sugar, dairy products, vegetables, and things of that kind, as they could be priced and are used most everywhere. This budget is not theoretical, because the items of food were not devised by experts or by dietitians in the laboratories; they were taken from the list of foods used by working people throughout the country, and amongst the families which were studied. If you were to study the list of the food, clothing and so on, you would find the most common items were chosen most of the time. I do not know whether you would be actually calling off the list, but I think a description of the budget itself will be sufficient. 5,961 pounds of food, dry weight, per year, or approximately 115 pounds per week for the family. About 100 pounds per week are articles of food of a more or less staple character, which may be purchased at any season of the year. 15 pounds is the variation that may be found in different seasons. In pricing that food, I took, of course, the price only of the produce in season. I took the kinds of foods that were to be found in the locality, and naturally if they were to be found in that locality, the family used them at that time. The budget divides the produce into three types, summer, winter and year round. That, of course, is merely an arbitrary subdivision. If you buy tomatoes in the winter time the price will vary from the price of tomatoes in the summer time. When I found myself last March in Nova Scotia, and tomatoes were not in season, I did not price tomatoes, but chose another vegetable in its place, which was in season. The same with clothing. That is also divided into seasons, summer, winter and year-round, and the budget gives a minimum of the requirements; merely those things which a family would absolutely need to keep itself in decency. The budget merely gives the price for the replacement of the clothing, not what has to be paid every year for new. For instance, one suit of clothes is given as one-third. That is, one suit has to last for three years; one coat to be bought to last four years for the wife, so that every three years the husband should buy a suit of clothes, or an overcoat, and every four years his wife should buy a coat. The budget in clothing is rather meagre, because it does not really allow for anything more

than what is considered bare necessities, and does not allow for what is considered more or less as style. It does not allow for silks for the wife; no silk stockings, but cotton ones; no silk dresses, because this is the minimum of health and decency, and a cloth dress, or cotton or lisle stockings are considered to last longer than silk,—although silk stockings are not considered a luxury by a workman's wife,—and they do not cost much more, (although you do not get silk; you get a concoction that is passed off as silk).

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. But it wears.—A. It wears, but we do not include the silk. For the children we have clothing that is absolutely necessary to keep them warm, and to keep them in appearance among other children at school. I leaned rather toward a mixture of wool and cotton in underclothing, and fleece linings, because it gives warmth, and is cheaper and lasts longer in the wash, and so on. There is a great deal of sewing provided for in the budget to be done at home. In that way a lot of economies can be made. The wife is recommended, by allowing for only the price of material, to make up at home, children's dresses, aprons, rompers, underclothing, and so on. There is no provision for extra summer dresses, aprons, and so on; so even with the housekeeping for a family of five, the wife doing her own shopping, etc., she is still required to make these economies by sewing at home.

Then in housing, I guided myself by the standard requirements for health and decency as laid down, and agreed upon by not only experts, but most of us who understand what a healthy standard ought to be. The conclusion is that the housing standard which is to be based upon a health requirement, must provide for ample ventilation, light, sanitation, privacy, and proper separation of sexes. That is agreed upon. The factors, of course, that are to be taken into account, are the number of rooms for a standard house. For the average standard family, a five roomed house has been taken. You cannot always, of course, get a ready made house with five rooms; so in pricing the rent, I chose a house with six rooms, as most houses are built that way, while in some cases I found houses of eight rooms with one or two rooms rented; so the family were using, say, from six to seven rooms. Then, of course, every room must have a window. Most houses are built that way. I think there is no disagreement at all to-day that a house which is built for health purposes ought to have a bath, ought to have decent water provisions, and ought to have proper drainage and water supply, ought to have lighting, ought to have a furnace, and other facilities, which would allow the family to keep themselves warm, sufficiently for health, and sufficiently for their comfort, and so on. There are certain requirements laid down for the size of the rooms; I think most houses are built with a reasonably large bedroom, say a minimum of eight by ten; a fairly large living room, say perhaps eight by twelve; a dining room eight by twelve, a kitchen ten by twelve, and so on.

Discussion followed.

The Witness: I think we are discussing here the basic requirements, as to whether people will be able to live upon a certain wage. That was what I was speaking of. As to what people do with their money when they get it, as to what their individual tastes are, whether they will buy a dress or a phonograph is another matter. I had an experience of five or six years before I got my education to this point, in offices, and I found many of the girls with whom I worked, would go to work in a $40 dress and eat a ten-cent lunch. In order to buy the $40 dress, they would eat a sandwich and drink a glass of Coca-cola. There is no doubt that was undermining their health, but they considered appearances before health. That is a question of individual educa-

tion. If we are to lay down a basic requirement for health, our next job will be to educate people how to use their money. I think we can do that. We have done a lot already.

Now, for the furniture. This furniture budget simply lists the minimum requirements for decency; it lists only those things in a home without which you really could not get along. You need tables and chairs; you need a rug on the floor, to some extent, no matter how cheap it is. The Bureau discusses the need of a rug in this way. The housewife, who has to look after a family of five, do her own shopping, her own sewing, her own washing and so on, ought to be given the advantage of certain labour-saving devices. They consider if she does not have to scrub the floor every day, it is equivalent to a labour-saving device, and her health is saved. On the other hand, the presence of a rug adds to the comfort and brightness of a home, and that, of course, is a great deal in family life, and human dwellings. To go on; the living room and the dining room: they must have at least tables and chairs from which to eat. We are not in China, and we do not sit on the floor eating with rice picks. The requirements provide for a certain amount of bedding, and a certain amount of bed furnishings, like coverings, and so on, to keep the beds clean and warm. The kitchen requires a stove and certain utensils, without which no family can get along. That is all that the budget provides for; chairs, and table for the living room; chairs and table for the dining room, a bureau for the dining room, a dresser and bed for the bedroom and utensils and stove, and covering for the floors. The budget presumes that these are the minimum requirements for a workman's family home, and the budget lists the cost for the replacement of them, seven per cent a year. We wanted to arrive at the cost, and we priced these items in ten Canadian cities, and from that we deducted the seven per cent annual upkeep.

To keep a family healthy and clean you require certain kinds of cleaning supplies, such as soap, tooth brushes, combs, and so forth. By the way, the woman is not allowed a haircut as yet; only the husband and children. A woman's haircut is extra, and I did not dare include that in our budget. However, I suppose she saves on thread and pins, and things like that, and gets her own hair cut anyway. She needs laundry soap, and starch, and a multitude of little things like that; ammonia, blueing, and so forth, and these must all be allowed for.

Now then we come to what are considered "Sundries;" they are those things which a family ought to be allowed as a minimum to keep themselves in dignified comfort. Take the case of medical care. You might say that a working man in a large industrial city has the advantage of public clinics, but my experience advises me to say we should allow the workman a sum to look after his own medical needs, because the public clinic of to-day is the kind that pauperizes people. It ought not to be. The public hospital ought to be so arranged that it would be a public service to the community at large. It receives a certain subsidy from the city, and yet a dignified worker, who has been working for his living all his life, does not like the idea of standing in line, and waiting around to receive any kind of public medical assistance that may or may not be of help. It is undignified, and it is certainly most unsatisfactory. A great deal of good is done, I will admit, but the type of people who really go there are those who are paupers, who receive charity, and the hospital is giving this as a charity service. It ought not to be, but it is. The workman who makes his own living ought not to be subjected to receiving charity service; he ought to have enough set by so if necessary he can call in a doctor whenever required, go to a dentist regularly, go to an oculist whenever he requires it, and have such amount of medicines as from time to time would be required.

[Miss Margaret S. Gould.]

Now, with regard to amusements and recreation; you might spend an evening which would not cost you any money, but you do not spend all your evenings at home, and you do not want to. The budget provides for a minimum of $20 a year for such amusements as picnics, which require a certain amount of carfare and food; for a trip on the river or the lake; fishing, and so on, or an ocasional visit to the movies for the different members of the family. It does not allow for an annual vacation.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Have you included newspapers and books?—A. Yes, I will come to that. There is another requirement for every human being. If a man is to keep in touch with events in his country, or outside his country, he must have access to the newspapers and periodicals. This, being a minimum budget, only allows for one daily and one weekly newspaper, the presumption being that his other educational needs, such as books and journals, will be met by the public libraries. When you begin to apply that to conditions in various localities, you find he has not these opportunities all the time. For instance, take medical assistance. Only in the large cities in Canada do you have large hospitals with public clinics; in the smaller cities you do not get that.

Discussion followed.

The Witness: With regard to education. This budget is woefully meagre in allowing merely a daily and weekly newspaper; it does not allow for journals or books. Again, there are certain restrictions to be found in the public library service of small towns. They are only open two or three evenings a week, supply is limited, and if people are interested in books, they have to buy them or go without.

Discussion followed.

The Witness: Now, there are other items, such as carfare. A worker in an industrial city must ride to and from his work. In only two cities of which I know is it not necessary for him to ride to work. Those are Truro and Kamloops, where the towns are small, and they can walk. So 600 rides are allowed for the father to ride to his work, and a certain number for the wife to go on shopping errands and so on. Then there are certain incidentals such as telephones. We do not allow for a telephone in the house, but even workmen occasionally require the use of a phone, and a certain amount is allowed for long distance calls, or for telephoning to a friend. Telegrams: even a worker has to send a telegram to announce a death or wedding. Postage and tobacco: I don't know whether you gentlemen would consider that a luxury, but a certain amount is included in the budget for that. Now, this, in very brief outline, is the minimum budget which will allow a family to live on a level of health, as set down by dietitians and others, for the requirements of food and clothing, and which has been set down by those who have studied this matter intensively, in the matter of household furnishings and sundries. The Bureau goes on to say, "It is rather intended to establish a bottom level of health and decency, below which a family cannot go, without danger of physical and moral deterioration. The budget does not include many comforts which should properly be included in what is designated as 'an American standard of living', thus no provision is directly made for services, other than insurance."

You said "After he has paid for all that, what has he left?" In the first place, many families have not enough to pay out with, and have to get along with much less than this budget lists.

By the Chairman:

Q. What policy of life insurance is provided?—A. $5,000 policy for life, and $1,000 for personal belongings or household effects. There can hardly be any greater tragedy than having your household belongings burned down, with nothing left and no insurance. There is very little left to provide for vacations. There are other comforts which might be included in the clothing budget, which are not included, because this is a most meagre one, and merely allows for body covering for warmth, and a certain kind of style that can be found at a minimum expenditure.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Is there any allowance for union dues?—A. Yes, there are certain allowances to belong to organizations. This includes for the church $10 a year, and labour unions $13 a year. It allows only for this. The working man may belong to other lodges, but has to practice personal economies on his tobacco, perhaps, to provide for that.

Now, as to the investigation in Canadian cities: the investigation was carried out in ten cities: in the Maritime Provinces, Sydney, Truro, and Moncton; Toronto, Belleville, Montreal and Coteau Junction, Quebec, and in the west, Winnipeg, Saskatoon and Kamloops. The Canadian Brotherhood chose those on the basis of the large, medium, and small towns. These are railroad cities, in which railroad workers live, because they were the workers which concerned us the most. Now, in pricing the budget, I did the following. When I arrived in each city, I established first which were the working class sections, so that the stores which were visited by myself, were selling goods that were chosen, and were the stores that the working people patronized. The houses I chose for pricing were in the better class working sections. That is to say, they were houses which stood on streets that were far away from the slums. When I say "far away" I mean had no connections with, or no signs of the slums in them; houses that were well built, in decent repair, no leaks in the roof, no damp cellars, and so on; houses which were of five, or six, or seven rooms, as I was able to find them; houses which had the maximum of plumbing necessities; most of the houses had the three piece bathrooms, and a furnace. In some cities, furnaces were not so prevalent. In Kamloops, for instance, not many houses have furnaces, but there are other ways provided for heating, and that was noted. On each item of the budget, I have five quotations. For the food, I visited five butchers, five grocers, and five greengrocers, and so on, so I would have a wide area to figure from, which would give me an average. For the clothing I visited the departmental stores patronized by the working classes. I did not take the highest class store, with exclusive goods, although in many cases, if I venture an opinion, where I found these stores were patronized by workers, I found the quality of goods sold there in many cases, more economical for the price than the lower priced articles. So on the whole, all was from the point of real economy, depending upon the length of wear, appearance and general satisfaction of an article. I must say that manufacturing is so standardized now that there is not very great difficulty in making a choice. Of course, you must remember, this is a personal choice. It may not be so easy by mail or catalogue, but if an investigation is made personally, there is not that amount of difficulty in choosing what is wanted from the tremendous and overwhelming amount of goods on sale. I found in pricing an overcoat, one could hit upon an economical overcoat and purchase it where it was the cheapest. I found that cheapness in price was cheapness in quality and durability, and I entirely kept away from the cheaper priced things. I chose the stores on the basis of reliability: A store that had been in the neighbourhood for some time, that does not sacrifice quality to price, a store that does not aim to sell too cheaply, too low, or too high. On the whole, I found those the kind of stores that the

workmen patronize. The food stores I chose both in the sections in which the workers lived, and in the downtown sections. In the larger cities they have the groceterias in the department stores, like Eaton's, whose business is done in great volume. I did the same thing with furniture. I chose only those stores which sell reliable and well-known goods. I chose on a cash basis, not a credit or installment basis in all things, and as far as possible in the Canadian investigation, I followed closely in line with quality, that is to say, quality consistent with economy, and tried to adhere closely to what the workmen chose for themselves. Therefore, where the workmen purchased in a certain store, I chose that store for the same article. I found that in every store, in every locality and every city, most prices were reasonably the same. Most of the things the people in Canada bought—or at least a great many of them—were preferably bought in the large departmental stores, such as Eatons. The Eatonia goods, which Eaton sells, is said to have beside good quality, the advantage of being made in Canada, so that this is a Canadian budget in so far as the goods were priced in Canadian stores; prices taken are on Canadian made goods, bought by Canadian workmen, in the workers' sections, and on the basis of the requirements set down by the minimum health and decency standard.

Now then, as to the cost of the budget. We have been discussing up to now what is necessary, irrespective of what it would cost. We left the money question entirely out. Money has nothing to do with what we need. We need food and clothing, and shelter, whether we have the money or not. If we have not the money, we die, or lack those things, and become ill. Now, we know what it is necessary to have, and we also know the prices from the stores in these ten Canadian cities. This budget was priced in 1925. I started out in the spring, went through the summer, and ended up in November, so that we have a well rounded representation of the seasons. What food I did not find in season in the spring I found in the summer or fall. As for furniture and clothing; these are more consistent. Most of the food on the budget is standard all the year round. There are only slight variations in the fruits and vegetables.

The average cost of the budget in Canada is $2,202.37. Food for the year for a family of five cost $639.04; the clothing is divided amongst the different members of the family: for the husband $118.70; for the wife $147.60; for the boy of 12, $83.21; for the girl of six, $65.14, and for the boy of two, $38.26. The seven per cent annual upkeep for the furniture and furnishings came to $68.59; the cost of the furniture which is to be placed, or should be placed in the workmen's homes, comes to $979.93. The rent, light and heat for a family of five in a six room house amounts to $565.30. In the fuel must be included the gas. (I may say that I have here a sample copy of the budget). Cleaning supplies: that is to say, soap for personal and household use, and other incidentals in connection with cleaning, $44.10 for the year. Miscellaneous items: insurance, recreation—oh, I omitted to mention a very important item under "Miscellaneous." The budget allows for household help for the wife one day a week, on the assumption that a woman who has to do her own housework for the family, to give a certain amount of her time to her children, and therefore, she ought to be allowed assistance in the household with the laundry and the scrubbing, etc., on one day a week. This amounts to $105 for the year. Newspapers, organizations and incidentals are allowed for the year at $432.43.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Did you allow anything extra for the extra help a woman has to have at the time of childbirth?—A. None of that is considered, $70 a year is allowed for medical assistance.

Mr. HAMILTON: That would come under medical treatment.

Discussion followed.

The committee adjourned until Thursday, May 20th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

THURSDAY, May 20, 1926.

The Committee on Industrial Relations called for this morning, failed to secure a quorum, and was adjourned until Tuesday, May 25, 1926, at 11 a.m.

(Filed by Witness Margaret S. Gould)

TYPES OF COST OF LIVING STUDIES.

Cost of living studies may be separated into three distinct classes:

1. *Statistical.* Those made by governments for statistical purposes; to secure information on the cost of living to have a basis for ascertaining and measuring the changes in the cost of living in the country.

2. *Sociological.* Those made by sociologists and statisticians for the purpose of determining the standards of living among the poorer classes of workers and for establishing the minimum cost of subsistence.

3. *Quantity Budgets.* Studies made by economists, sociologists, government and statistical bureaux, trade unions and others in an endeavour to lay down budgetary definitions—what a family ought to have in order to live 'properly' and 'decently'—by which to determine a fair wage.

1. *Statistical Studies:* To determine the cost of living of a whole country offers many difficulties because of the obviously unequal social and economic conditions among the various peoples in different parts of the country. However a beginning was made in the United States in 1893 when sufficient information was collected to form the basis for weighting increases in the cost of living (1).

In the years 1900 to 1902, a country-wide survey was made which not only formed the basis for subsequent calculations of changes in prices, but because of the great body of data collected, has been the means of checking later studies. This investigation was made for the purpose of meeting the continuing popular demand for information on the cost of living. The survey includes an analysis of the incomes and expenditures of 25,440 families in 33 states and contains a large amount of data on retail prices of food.

The information was collected by agents of the Bureau of Labour Statistics through personal visits to the families studied. These families were selected without regard to industry, but included wage earners or clerical workers receiving less than $1,200 a year. The number of families chosen in each locality corresponded closely to the total number of wage-earners in manufacturing in each particular section of the country. The data thus collected were analyzed so as to show in detail the membership of the family, the occupation, the earnings and unemployment of the head of the family, also the family incomes and expenditures.

Out of the 25,440 families, 2,567 were selected as a separate group for study. The principal of selection was their ability and willingness to give the necessary information. These families were considered to be in every way representative of the total group. The expenditures and incomes of these families were studied in close detail; and particular attention was paid to the proportions of the income spent for different items in the family budget, especially for food. It is the average expenditure for each of the different items in the food budgets of these families which the Bureau of Labour Statistics used until January, 1921, as the weight given that item in computing changes in retail prices of food from month to month, between 1890 and 1920 (2).

Another group of families selected for special study from the total of 25,440, was one of 11,156, which the Bureau designated "normal" families, i.e. those

(1) United States. "Retail Prices and Wages." 52nd Congress, 1st Session. Senate Report No. 986, Washington, 1892.

(2) EighteentAnnual Report of thCommissioner of Labour, p. 75.

in which the husband was at work, where there was a wife, not more than five children, and none over fourteen years of age, where there were no dependents, no boarders or servants, and in which there were expenditures for all of the major items in the family budget. These families averaged 3.96 persons and their average cost of living was less than that of the other two groups of larger families. The expenditures of these families were analyzed with reference to size, nativity of the chief wage-earner, geographical location, and the amount of the income (1).

The study of the 25,440 families and of each of the two subsidiary analyses offered, each within its scope, a mass of information which helped to lay the foundations for many subsequent studies. From the broad general survey of the total group of families collected, the size, average income, sources of income, and expenditures of American wage-earners' families in 1900-02 is derived. These lived in all sections of the country; they were unselected and included representatives of every size, and the great majority with a husband, wife and one or more children. They also included boarders, servants, wage-earning children contributing all of their incomes, non-wage-earning children and other dependents. The average size of these 25,440 families was 4.88 persons. A classification of the income in relation to the sources from which it was derived showed that the average total income was earned by the father, 1.47 per cent by the mother, 9.49 per cent by the children, 7.78 per cent was paid by boarders and lodgers, and 1.77 per cent came from other sources (2).

No attempt was made as a result of this study to establish a minimum standard of living or to determine how much was required to maintain what might be agreed upon as a fair standard, nor was any relationship drawn between these findings and wage rates. The fact regarding income and expenditures were set forth in great detail and readers were left to draw their own conclusions.

In 1909 an investigation of the cost of living in American towns was made by agents of the British Board of Trade as part of a comprehensive survey of conditions of working class life in the principal industrial countries. This survey included 29 cities in the East, South and Middle West of the United States, and covered a total population in 1910 of fifteen and one-half million people. Although principal attention was paid to the cost of food and shelter, family budgets were collected and interesting data assembled regarding the lives of American wage-earners.

A variety of agencies was used in collecting these budgets. Twenty-eight different nationalities were represented among 7,616 families, of whom 42.2 per cent were American, English, Irish, Scotch, Welsh and Canadian. The cost of living of these families is not given, and no generalizations are made regarding the division of income. But the evidence brought out by this study was with reference to the size and composition of the family; and the great value of this study lies in its confirmation of the findings of other investigators in local centres and in the light it throws on sources of family income (3).

The tremendous rise in prices during the war created many industrial problems, chief among which rose in the field of wages; and the need for more accurate knowledge of the cost of living among wage earners was felt. In 1917-18 the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics in co-operation with the Shipbuilding Labour Adjustment Board of the Emergency Fleet Corporation made an investigation of the cost of living in 35 communities on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes (4). In 1918-19,

(1) Ibid. p. 1.

(2) United States. Bureau of Labour Statistics. Eighteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner "Cost of Living and Retail Prices of Food." Washington, D.C., 1903.

(3) Great Britain: British Board of Trade, 1908. "Cost of Living in American Towns." Reprinted in Senate Document No. 22, Washington, D.C., 1911. A summary is printed in United States Bureau of Labor, Bulletin No. 93, March, 1911, pp. 500–556.

(4) United States Bureau of Labor. Monthly Labor Review, March, 1918, p. 112; April, 1918, p. 151; June, 1918, p. 99; August, 1918, p. 132; September, 1918, p. 115; October, 1918, p. 112; December, 1918, p. 115.

in co-operation with the National War Labour Board, a more extensive study was made, including some of these cities and adding other types of industrial and non-industrial centres, totalling in all, 92 communities (1). This latter study covered 12,096 white families and 741 coloured families. This study was made to cover expenditures for a year ending some time between July, 1918, and February, 1919. A wide variety of community types were included and all sections of the country were represented; cities of every size are in each representative group. Due to their method of selection, families averaged about the same size and composition for the country as a whole (2).

These studies of family budgets for the country as a whole presented the following: (a) Averages of conditions actually prevailing in American cities; (b) The average size of American wage-earners' families; (c) the sources of income in these families; (d) the manner in which this income is spent (3).

No attempt is made in these investigations to formulate a definite standard of living or to estimate the cost of maintaining it. The purpose which prompted these early studies was the desire to have actual knowledge of what items entered into the budgets of families selected as average American wage earners' families and the amounts spent on these items; and during the war years the purpose was to ascertain more accurately the kinds of items which entered into family consumption and how the cost of these have changed owing to the increase of prices due to wartime conditions.

2. *Sociological Studies.*—The problems of poverty have attracted the attention of almost all who have lived within sight of this social phenomenon. Those who have worked among the poor and have tried to cope with their sufferings, have tried also, in the course of their work, to depict their conditions and to lay bare the causes. One that stands out as a classic attempt in this field is the study of the poor of London, England, by Mr. Charles Booth (4). Many others have followed his example. Notable among the latter are: the study of poverty by Mr. Seebohm Rowntree (5); the study of working-class standards and cost of living on the west side of New York City by Mrs. More (6); the famous analysis of working-class family budgets by Dr. Chapin (7); the study of mill operatives' families by Miss Byington (8); the study of families living in the Kensington district of Philadelphia, by Cotton and Little (9).

All these investigations were made as matters of sociological interest, to obtain an insight into the general standard and cost of living among the groups which were studied. They offer an intimate analysis of the actual living conditions. They are what may be termed local studies, not broad and general; most of the families studied were personally known to the investigators, and these studies are valuable in that they give a criss-cross picture of the workers' lives in their daily social, economic and industrial relations.

Into these general picture studies however, some investigators wove a purpose: to determine what was the minimum amount of money necessary to maintain a family in health; and from this was led the way to a definition of a minimum standard of living,—defined in terms of money cost.

The methods of the investigators varied with the locality and with the material which they had to study. It is well worth tracing these methods, in order to understand the shades of later developments in this field.

---

(1) Idem, May, 1918, p. 147; June, 1919, p. 101; July, 1919, p. 75; August, 1919, p. 1,117.
(2) National Industrial Conference Board. Family Budgets of American Wage Earners, Research Report No. 41, 1921, p. 12.
(3) National Industrial Conference Board. Opp. cit. p. 10, 11.
(4) Booth, Charles: Life and Labour of the People in London, 1890.
(5) Rowntree, B. Seebohm: Poverty, A Study of Town Life, London, 1908.
(6) More, Louise Boland: Wage Earner's Budgets: A Study of Standard and Cost of Living, New York, 1907.
(7) Chapin, Robert Caib: The Standard of Living among Workingmen's Families in New York City, N.Y., 1909.
(8) Byington, Margaret F.: Homestead: The Households of a Mill Town. New York, 1910.
(9) Little, Esther Louise and Cotton, William Joseph Henry. "Budgets of Families and Individuals in Kensington, Philadelphia. Lancaster, 1920.

Mr. Rowntree desired to discover the true measure—in extent and depth—of poverty in his town. For such a general task, he states that only a house-to-house inquiry, extending to the whole of the working-class population of the city could give accurate results. In this way he obtained information regarding the housing, occupation, earnings and standard of life of every wage-earner's family in York, as well as the number and the age of the children in each family. His investigation extended itself to 11,560 families living in 388 streets and comprising a total population of 46,754. Since his inquiry was to ascertain, besides the proportion of the population living in poverty, also the nature of their poverty, he divided the population into two classes: primary and secondary poverty; in this way he considered to determine which families suffered poverty because of low wages, and which because of unwise spending. The principal by which he judged the sufficiency of wages, was the sum necessary to maintain "physical efficiency".

But in order to know what maintains "physical efficiency", Mr. Rowntree had first to arrive, by his own calculations, at a minimum sum which would buy this standard. This led him to a preliminary inquiry into the quantities and kinds of food which in the light of the most recent and complete investigations were requisite for that purpose. It involved also a knowledge and detailed estimate of the necessary expenditure upon rent and other family items.(1) From this inquiry and from the collection of data as to workers' families' actual expenditures and the nature of their home economy, Mr. Rowntree then established what he considered a minimum cost of living on the basis of "physical efficiency".

Mrs. More, a settlement worker in the lower west side of New York City, desired to establish the standard of living in the neighborhood. She and her assistants chose two hundred families; the only qualification for their selection was their willingness and ability to co-operate with the investigators. The records of the income and expenditures of these families were kept. The facts were then tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in the light of the investigators' *personal intimate* knowledge of the families. This study has not, like the English ones, the character of census taking.

The families were not selected for race, size, or occupation, though these might easily and probably were known. No arbitrary limits were set as to income; but as many families as possible above the so-called "dependent" class were chosen. They were composed of fathers, mothers, boarders, children at work, minor children and dependents, and were considered fairly representative of the district studied.

Mrs. More made a careful study of the family incomes, expenditures, their diet, clothing, and housing. From the data she collected of these average families in her district, Mrs. More established what she considered to be the minimum cost of living at that time in New York city. This minimum, she believed, "should be large enough not only to cover expenses which Mr. Rowntree calls 'necessary for maintaining physical efficiency', but it should allow for some recreation and a few pleasures, for sickness, short periods of unemployment, and some provision in the form of saving, insurance or membership in benefit societies." The cost for maintaining this minimum standard she derived from what she found her 200 families spent for food, because, she believed, the cost of maintaining a fair standard "depends primarily on the amount and cost of food necessary for proper nutrition. . ." On the total spent for proper food, she allowed for a larger proportion of surplus income than was found in these families, which if added, would provide the other items such as provision for

(1) Opp. Cit. p. 4.

the future, etc. From this she pointed to what income was necessary steadily during the year, if this minimum standard is to be purchased.(1)

The desire on the part of social workers in the State of New York to know the exact content of a "normal" standard of living, and what this would cost, gave rise to an investigation of the standard and cost of living among wage-earners' families in the city of New York, and was carried out in 1907 under the direction of Dr. Robert C. Chapin for the New York State Conference of Charities and Correction.

Information schedules were filled out by settlement and other social workers, by trade union members and by paid investigators. 642 schedules were received from Greater New York; 391 families were finally chosen for study, those families in which both parents were living, in which there were from two to four children under 16 years of age, and which had incomes ranging from $500 to $1,000.

Great care was taken to analyze the data in the most minute manner. The actual standards of living of the families chosen were established, after which the minimum cost of a normal standard of living was estimated. In this study Dr. Chapin scientifically established a "minimum of subsistence" level of living. By a careful analysis of what wage-earners' families spent in the highest of his chosen income group, he laid down a basis for comparing the standards of those in the lower income group; and determined thus the effects of lower incomes on the families concerned. From a study of the deficiencies of the lower income families, he concluded that in (1907) an income under $800 a year would not permit the maintenance of a normal standard of living, or the minimum of subsistence. He showed that those families who were trying to live on an income below this figure ($600-700) suffered the following deficiencies:

> ". . .the housing average shows scarcely more than three rooms for five persons. Fuel is gathered on the street. There is considerable underfeeding. They have to eke out their clothing by way of receipts of gifts. In sickness the dispensary is the main dependency, while the care of the teeth is scarcely thought of. Adequate furnishings of the home is hardly maintained. Families are prevented to maintain membership in such organizations as church, union or fraternal benefit. Recreation and education are reduced to a minimum, save insofar as they can be had without expense. There is a very narrow limit in the enjoyment of such items as come under the heading of miscellaneous, since they represent to some extent, the modest comforts which come above the physical necessities. As to provision for the future, industrial or burial insurance is one of the necessities that the poorest families try to provide, and the returns show cases where something is saved for this item, but such savings are at the expense of essentials of the present, as is seen in the number of underfed families reporting such a surplus. . . ."

On the other hand, Dr. Chapin states, an income of $900 or over, "probably permits the maintenance of a normal standard of living so far as the physical man is concerned." He arrived at this conclusion after a thorough examination of the items of the budgets of families receiving from $900 to $1,000 a year. There he found that:

> "....they are able, in general, to get food enough to keep body and soul together, and clothing and shelter enough to meet the most urgent demands of decency. 68 per cent of the families have four rooms or more, the average being 3.75 per cent rooms. The average expenditure for fuel allows comfortable, and only one quarter reported gathering wood in the

(1) More, opp. cit. pp. 269, 270.
The average standard of living depicted by Mrs. More may be said to be higher than would actually be found in the locality, for it should be remembered, that these families were selected because of their intelligence, and only those furnished information who could keep accounts and who could grasp the meaning of the investigation, and their standard is better than the average actually prevailing.—Author.

street. Food is bought sufficient to provide adequate nourishment. As to clothing, only one-fourth reported as depending on gifts to any extent. Dispensaries and free hospitals are not for these families the main dependence in times of illness. The expenditure on furniture show that the existing outfit is fairly well maintained and the equipment fairly comfortable. Participation in the benefits of labour unions or religious and fraternal organizations becomes possible for the majority of these people, and some margin is available for the pursuits of amusements and recreation, the purchase of books and papers and the indulgence of personal tastes outside of the indispensable necessities of existence. . . ."(1)

In the light of this careful accumulation of facts Dr. Chapin constructed a family budget which would give a minimum standard of living " at least so far as the physical man is concerned." This budget has been accepted as a standard and is widely used in measuring standards and cost of living (2).

In 1908 John R. Howard carried out a similar investigation in the city of Buffalo with findings comparable with those of Dr. Chapin for New York City (3).

As part of the Pittsburg survey of social and industrial conditions among the steel workers, Miss Byington, a social worker, made a study of individual households in Homestead, Pa. Ninety families kept a detailed record of their expenditures for a period of four to eight weeks. The families were unselected except for their willingness and ability to co-operate. The data were classified according to race and family income. The conclusion arrived at was: "that insofar as the 90 family budgets show, and at the range of prices current in Homestead, it is only when earnings are $15.00 a week or more, that we can look for a reasonable margin above the requisite expenditures for necessities. It is only in the group spending more than $20 that we find that the average family has reached a point where, without being spendthrift of the future and without undue pinching in other directions, they can spend enough to satisfy what we should recognize as the reasonable ambitions of an American who puts life into his work (4).

In 1908 the United States Bureau of Labour made a general study of the conditions of woman and child wage-earners in the cotton industry in the United States. The purpose was to throw light on the family economy of cotton mill operatives, as a complement to the study of wages and working conditions. A few families were studied intensively by agents of the Bureau and from this study deductions were drawn regarding southern cotton mill operatives as a class.

Nowhere are incomes or expenditures averaged, but on the basis of the study of the separate families, estimates were made as to the minimum cost of each item entering into the cost of living and of all items combined. The cost of a fair standard and of a minimum standard of living was then determined. Data are also given for computing the cost of maintaining larger or smaller families, of varying age and sex composition. The distinctive characteristic of this investigation, one writer states (5), is that each family was studied as a unit by itself, somewhat after the Lo Play method.

The minimum budget for a family of five was to provide only for the bare necessities of life, making no allowance whatever for the cultural wants. The

(1) Chapin, R. B. Quoted by Bureau of Applied Economics, "Standards of Living," Bulletin No. 7, pp. 145–148.

(2) Besides being quoted by numbers of trade union officials in wage arguments, Dr. Chapin's budget is given special note and used as a basis of figuring the minimum cost of living up to date, in: Memorandum on The Minimum Wage and Increased Cost of Living, prepared for the members of the National War Labor Board, and submitted by the Secretary at the Board's meeting on July 12, 1918. Printed by the Government printing office, Washington, D.C., 1918.

(3) Howard, John R. Study of Cost of Living in Buffalo, 1908.

(4) Byington, opp. cit. pp. 105–06.

(5) National Industrial Conference Board. Family Budgets of American Wage Earners. Research Report No. 41, Sept. 1921.

"fair" standard was one which allowed for the inclusion of cultural requirements, along the lines of the Chapin budget. The cost of maintaining these two budgets were given as being in 1908, $408.26 for the minimum, and $600.74 for the "fair" standard, per year (1).

In the same year a similar study was carried out in Fall River, Mass., a New England cotton mill community, and the two standards of living mentioned above, were established and the cost calculated (2).

In 1909-1910, a group of investigators, under the direction of Mr. J. C. Kennedy, made a study of the Chicago stockyards district. This was a part of a study carried out by the University of Chicago Settlement of the wages and family budgets of working class people in that district. The families studied were thought to represent fairly both the racial and the income distribution of all families in the community, families here were known to be almost entirely foreign, and predominantly of Slavic stock. The budgets of 88 Polish families 68 Lithuanian, and 28 of other races were studied. An attempt to determine from these budgets what was the "minimum amount necessary to support a family decently in the stockyards district, at prices prevailing in 1910" was made. The conclusions arrived at was that $800 was the minimum amount on which a family of five could live decently and efficiently, and without indulging in luxuries (3).

The next study of importance was the one made in New York City and Buffalo in 1914, by the New York State Factory Investigating Commission, directed by Mr. Frank H. Streighthoff. The purpose of these studies was "to determine, as definitely as possible, the amount of money necessary for life in simple decency and efficiency." This was held to include a sufficient amount of nourishing and palatable food, clothing which would "afford protection against all the extremes of weather," and which would also include "the garments necessary to a proper appearance while at work, as well as apparel for use at social affairs or religious assemblies; a house which would meet definitely established standards of light and sanitation, and in addition, provision for "intellectual recreation and progress." This latter was explained to mean that there must be newspapers or periodicals to keep the individual in touch with world events and local affairs. There must be available funds to put the children through grammar school at least, and there must be opportunity for amusement, for social life, and for religious worship. Moreover, there must be included in the standard provision for emergencies such as ill health, death and old age. This, the Commission said, is the general concept of a decent livelihood . . . . the term 'cost of living,' as used in this report is the amount of money necessary to provide a decent livelihood.

Budgets were collected from 34 families in New York City, from 18 families in Buffalo and from 17 families in Troy. In addition to information gathered from a study of these budgets, the cost of maintaining the described standard of living was arrived at in the following manner: The cost of food in New York was obtained by adding to the amount described as necessary in the Chapin investigation, an amount sufficient to allow for the increased cost between 1907 and 1914, and to meet certain objective tests of sufficiency as determined by those closely in touch with the food requirements of wage earners' families. The allowance for rent was based on a preconceived standard suitability and checked by the study of housing available. The standard of clothing was arrived at by theoretical estimates and by the expenditures of actual families. The outlay for fuel and light was also derived from earlier studies, and confirmed by current practice among chosen families. Sundries were chosen according to the experience and judgment of the investigators (4). On

(1) Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners. opp. cit. pp. 142.
(2) Ibid. Vol. XVI, pp. 176, 184.
(3) Kennedy, J. C.: "Wages and Family Budget in the Chicago Stockyards District, Chicago, 1914.
(4) Report of the New York Investigating Commission, opp. cit. pp. 138 ff.

the basis of these studies conclusions were drawn that in 1914, $876.43 was the minimum cost of living for a family of five in New York City for a year (1).

All of these studies, though differing from one another in point of initial interest and methods, had as a common purpose the determination of the *minimum cost* of living among the groups studied. This minimum was derived directly from the expenditures of the families whose budgets were analyzed (2). In all the families were not taken at random, but were selected for study within specified groups separated according to income. The incomes were believed to represent the average or typical income of wage-earners' families. And while the average expenditures of the families studied may not be said to fairly represent the typical family's expenditures, the fair minimum standard established was true of these chosen families. This standard it was believed by Chapin and others, supplied the requirements of a minimum 'American' type of living. It not only includes (and should include) allowances for the elementary necessities of food, shelter, clothing, fuel and light, but it also makes some provision for those sundries which are usually considered a part of an American standard of living, such as medical care, church contributions, carfare, insurance and other miscellaneous items. Estimates as to the content and cost of this standard were made on what workingmen's families in the communities surveyed, were actually using; and on what was actually available in the district where they lived.

3. *Quantity Budgets.*

The war gave an unprecedented impetus to the general interest in the subject of cost of living. Prices rose so high and so quickly, wages failed notoriously to keep pace with these rising prices, and in all parts of the world, and spheres of labour, prices and wages became of most poignant interest to governments, employers and workers.

Those governments which had already been making cost of living surveys continued to do so, thus offering up-to-date statistics on the cost of living. In December, 1916, Congress authorized the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics to make an investigation of the cost of living among wage-earners in the District of Columbia, to offer, apart from other purposes, an opportunity to the Commissioner of Labour Statistics to answer constantly recurring questions regarding the standard and cost of living among wage-earners' families. Those governments which had not hitherto instituted cost-of-living surveys, began during this period to do so.

But the interest in cost-of-living had already been widely created by the studies made by social workers; furthermore these studies created also an intelligent interest in standard-of-living. Trade unions and other agencies sought to use the information brought out in these studies, and on the strength of them to advocate better wages and possibly living conditions for the workers. The phrase "an American standard" of living came into vogue.

Before the war this "American standard of living" was used synonymously with so many dollars and cents, $800 or $900 a year stood for a 'decent' or 'fair' or 'minimum health' standard of living; less than that brought human deterioration. When the delerious rise in the price of commodities came in the war years, how could the 'American standard of living' be interpreted? Money value

(1) Since the war prices and living cost have changed so that it is not possible for us today to gain a correct appreciation of the relation between the above figures and the earnings and standards of living among the wage-earners in that day. For a comparative analysis of this relationship, see: "Facing Old Age," ch. V, by Abraham Epstein (New York, 1920), also: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Supplement 1921, vol. 97–99: "Have American Wages Permitted an American Standard of Living?" by A. Epstein.

(2) These notably are the studies by Chapin, More, Howard, Kennedy, The United States Bureau of Labor in the cotton mill districts. The investigation by the New York State Factory Investigation reflects less directly the budget collected, and represents more the prevailing standard and cost of living in the communities surveyed. See: National Industrial Conference Board, opp. cit. pp. 31, 32.

flew away out of proportion of the things it stood for. It is true that in the first attempt to cross this bridge the already existing budgets,—Chapin's and the one made by the New York Factory Investigating Commission—were used to measure the cost of living in terms of changed prices. But there were those, especially in the ranks of organized labour, who claimed that these budgets were not competent to measure existing standards of living, and that these were further unsatisfactory because they were based on the standards prevailing among the very low,—paid unskilled and semi-skilled workers. War industry, changes in methods of machine production, the rush of labour organization, and the almost complete upheaval in purchasing standards and other forms of home economy, called for revised and new methods of interpreting and establishing the cost of living.

The first attempt was made by the Bureau of Municipal Research of Philadelphia. In 1916-18 the Bureau made a study to determine the cost of maintaining a "fair minimum" standard of living among city employees. This they set about to do by endeavouring to express in terms of quality and quantity, as well as of price, the makeup of a fair standard of living. The basis of the estimates of the content and cost of a fair standard was a group of 260 family' budgets, which included expenditures for a year ending sometime between August 15, 1917, and May 15, 1918. They were obtained by home visits and from account books kept by families of skilled and unskilled workers in all sections of Philadelphia. The requisites were that families should be self-supporting, that the principal breadwinner should earn not more than $2,000 a year, and that there should be children under 14 years of age. From a study of the quantity and cost of articles used by these 260 families, it was estimated that, in the autumn of 1918, $1,636.79 annually, would be required to support a family consisting of husband, wife and three children under 14 years of age at a fair standard of living.

In devising the budget the Bureau paid particular attention to quantity and quality with the idea that the items listed could be priced from time to time and that city employees' wages could be adjusted accordingly. Eighty-two per cent of the budget was thus specified. The specified standard included housing, fuel and light, food, clothing, carfare, cleaning supplies and services; the unspecified standard included health, furniture and furnishings, taxes, dues and contributions, recreation and amusement, education and reading, insurance and miscellaneous; this constituted the remaining eighteen per cent of the budget. On analysis of the 260 family budgets it was found that the cost of the unspecified standard averaged about twenty-one per cent of the specified standard, and this ratio has been therefore maintained in the studies made by the Bureau subsequently.(1)

From the knowledge that was had of wage earners' home economy, of their income and expenditures, followed by estimates of the minimum standard and cost of living, it became possible to make estimates without the collection of budgets. This became especially important when budgets were desired quickly for use in wage settlements.

The problems that had to be met in making an investigation of the cost of living on this plan, were: first, to determine the standard of living whose cost was to be measured; second, to fix the size and composition of the family to whom this standard was to apply; third, to collect prices of the various

(1) Bureau of Municipal Research of Philadelphia: Workingmen's Standard of Living in Philadelphia· Report issued by William C. Beyer, in charge, Rebekah P. Davis and Myra Thwing, assistants. Published by Macmillan Co., New York, Oct., 1918.

The Bureau made a supplementary investigation to ascertain the cost of the same quantity budget at the prices then prevailing, in November, 1919. This was published in the bulletin of the Bureau, "Citizens' Business", December 4, 1919, bulletin No. 393. This was followed by two other supplements: Bulletin No. 433, in August, 1920, and Bulletin No. 463, in March, 1921.

goods and services listed. Such an investigation therefore becomes a study of items making up a family budget, and the cost of these, rather than a study of family expenditures for such items.

As has already been cited (1), budgetary estimates of the cost of living were established by Chapin and then followed by others. This estimate was for a minimum of health standard, below which no workingman could live without danger to health. They were arrived at from a study of the actual expenditures of certain (lower) income groups.

In 1915, the first attempt was made to estimate the cost of maintaining a somewhat different standard. This standard has been variously designated as a "minimum comfort budget" (2); or a "minimum standard of wholesale living" (3); or a "minimum standard of health and decency" (4). Such budgets are higher than the level developed by Chapin and others, and are based on the budgets of higher paid and skilled workers (5). In some instances these budgets have been related to the standards and requirements of a given set of workers, in a given community (6); in others no account has been taken of specific local conditions but a general budget has been formulated based on ideals and put forth as of general application (7).

While the first group of budgets aimed to determine the limit below which family expenditures could not go without the sacrifice of something absolutely essential to the maintenance of a minimum health standard of life, and were based on conditions found prevailing in a given locality, among a chosen group of families, those in the second group include items and amounts which add to the comfort of the family, and introduce also those items which have raised debates as to whether or not they can rightfully be called necessities.

The steps taken to arrive at a fair estimate of the cost of living without having first to collect and analyze actual family budgets were developed in the following investigations (8):

In 1915 the Bureau of Personal Service of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York, found it necessary to standardize the salaries of employees of that city. In co-operation with the Bureau of Municipal Research, a study was made of the cost of living for an unskilled labourer's family in New York. To decide upon the composition of such a worker's family, the Board first considered the average size of families among labourers in general, in the United States, in the City of New York, and among the rank and file of the Department of Street Cleaning in particular. It was then decided to select for purposes of study a family consisting of five members: a wage-earner, his wife and three children of school age, who could not be expected to contribute to the family support (9).

---

(1) See page .. of this paper.

(2) Bureau of Applied Economics, "Standards of Living," Bulletin No. 7, page 97: Budget Awarded in Seattle and Tacoma Street Railway Arbitration, 1917.

(3) Ibid. p. 215; A Minimum Budgetary Estimate for Pacific Coast Workers, 1917.

(4) Bureau of Applied Economics, "Standards of Living," pp. 27: "Budget for a Government Employees' Family in Washington, D.C.," U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 1919. Published under the title: Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget Necessary to Maintain a Family of Five in Washington, D.C. at a level of Health and Decency.

(5) National War Labour Board. Memorandum on the Minimum Wage and Increased Cost of Living. Submitted by the Secretary at the Request of the Board at its Meeting on July 12, 1918, Washington, p. 14. "Minimum Comfort Budgets Level Above Subsistence."

(6) "Standards of Living," opp. cit. pp. 26-47; "Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget Necessary to Maintain a Family of Five in Washington at a level of Health and Decency." Also: pp. 64-72: "Workingmen's Standard of Living in Philadelphia"; pp. 96-100: "Budget Award in Seattle and Tacoma St. Railway Arb."; 115-117: "Minimum Budgetary Estimate for Pacific Coast Workers." See also: Monthly Labour Review, February, 1921, pp. 61-66.

(7) "Standards of Living," opp. cit. pp. 1-25: "Minimum Quantity Budget Necessary to Maintain a Workers' Family of Five in Health and Decency." U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 1920.

(8) A number of estimates of the minimum cost of living have been prepared by charitable societies. See: National Industrial Conference Board, Research Report No. 41, pp. 38.

(9) Ibid. pp. 38-9: New York City. Board of Estimate and Apportionment. Report on the Cost of Living for an Unskilled Labourer's Family in New York City. Submitted by the Bureau of Standards to the Committee on Salary and Grades, 1915.

When the composition of the family had been determined, the content of the standard of living was then established on the following basis:

(*a*) Food: The amount of food required was based on the scientific knowledge as given by the analysis of foods by nutrition experts and dietitians, as to the quantity of the different kinds of food required by a family of the type under consideration (1).

(*b*) Clothing: The estimate for clothing was made in the same way as that for food, based on "average common sense requirements" (2).

(*c*) Shelter: On this item the report states: "A family consisting of five people needs at least four rooms to meet the demands of decency" (3).

(*d*) Sundries: The items such as carfare, fuel and light, care of health, insurance, recreation(4), reading material, church contributions, etc., were listed in a similar manner (5).

The requirements of the entire budget having thus been determined, their cost was ascertained by collecting prices of the goods and services in representative neighbourhoods where unskilled labourers lived and made their purchases.

Of this type are the studies made by the National Industrial Conference Board, who has published six reports on the cost of living among wage-earners in specified localities. A family of two adults and three children under fourteen years of age, where the father was the only wage-earner was adopted as the unit of measurement. The standard of living prevailing among the wage-earners studied in each locality was carefully noted. Thus the housing standards varied from place to place and the allowances in the cost of them. Food and clothing lists were slightly modified from place to place, prevailing means of heat and lighting were always taken into account, and such of sundries, as carfare, recreation etc. were varied to meet local requirements. In this way, although based on the theoretical requirements of a theoretical family, the minimum standard and cost of living for a family of the given size, and competition was very closely approximated.

An analysis of these minimum budgets for wage-earners as constructed by the National Industrial Conference Board, indicates that provision is made not only for the elementary necessities but also for certain more cultural although none the less fundamental needs of the family. Because a careful study was made of the racial habits, local customs, and goods and services available in each locality, the budgets represent a practical standard even though they are based on so-called theoretical needs (6).

For the use of an arbitration board appointed to settle a dispute resulting in a strike of conductors of the San Francisco-Oakland and San Jose Railway (Key Division in Alameda County, Cal., Jessica B. Piexotto of the Department of Economics of the University of California, prepared a detailed estimate of the cost of the items required to maintain a workingman, his wife and three children of school age in San Francisco, at a "minimum standard of wholesome living and not mere subsistence." This budget was provided for the class of workman who "insists upon having food enough to provide a palatable and somewhat varied dietary; shelter and clothing that conforms to the traditional ideas of the 'decencies' rather than the 'necessities'; some income to pay for schooling the children, for relaxing in leisure hours, and something to provide

(1) New York City, opp. cit. pp. 12, 13.
(2) ibid, p. 14.
(3) ibid, p. 11.
(4) ibid, p. 16. The report states: "For recreation, we have allowed occasional trips to the beach, incidental carfare, moving picture shows, Christmas and birthday presents, and miscellaneous amusements."
(5) ibid, p. 16.
(6) National Industrial Conference Board. Family Budgets of American Wage-earners. Research Report No. 41. New York, Sept. 1921, pp. 40, 41.

against the emergencies of ill health, invalidity and death." $110 a month necessary.

From this reasoning, professor Piexotto concluded that $110 a month was necessary if " a family of man, wife and three children of school age are to be maintained without getting into debt, or receiving aid. When the normal breadwinner is paid less than this sum, one of three things, any one of them harmful for the group and for the community, is likely to happen:

> "1. Other members of the family will have to work to eke out the income, or
>
> 2. There will be less food than is necessary for the men to do efficient work. The risks of ill health to all members of the group and the consequent costs to the group and to society are equally plain, or
>
> 3. The group must go without many articles noted under Sundries and House Operations . . . . and one of the most important differences between social dependents, potential or actual, and self-supporting citizens, is that the former are willing to go without, and capable men and women realize the importance and the imperative need for the money that will buy those things the term covers . . . ."

Inspection of the individual items show that very modest sums have been assigned to each class of wants. Miss Piexotto claims that the housewife who keeps within the amounts specified must still have to be a cautious purchaser and capable of preparing foodstuffs and industrious in making clothes (1).

In the fall of 1917, a wage dispute having arisen between the Puget Sound Traction, Light and Power Company, the Tacoma Railway and Power Company, and their employees, a board of arbitration was appointed to determine what wages should be paid. The award granted was on the basis of the budget submitted by William F. Ogburn of the University of Washington. This budget Professor Ogburn called " A minimum comfort budget and slightly higher than a minimum health budget " (2). The minimum comfort budget was designed for the needs of a family of five for the following reasons: (*a*) Three children at least are necessary for the race to perpetuate itself. (*b*) Federal and State experts do not make out budgets for less than for families of five, thus, neither public nor expert opinion sanctions a smaller standard. (*d*) Unmarried men are less desirable than married men, individually and socially, physically and morally; and the economic barrier to marriage is recognized as an important one " (3).

The budget was claimed as not being an ideal one. The clothing estimates were made on the assumption that the wife does some sewing and remaking of some garments for the children. The figures were based on estimates of the life of garments to fractions of years. Various dietaries with differing proportions of meats, vegetables, fats, etc., were constructed, and the calorie requirements slightly over 12,000 a week for the family of five. The meat allowance was actually lower than prevailed among carmen's families, and insurance and savings items were larger (4).

In August, 1919, the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics made a study of the cost of living in the District of Columbia. This was for two purposes. The first, to establish a " quantity budget " in which emphasis would be laid on amounts, qualities and frequency of replacements; the second was to ascertain the cost of purchasing such goods and services included in the quantity budget

(1) Memorandum on the Minimum Wage, opp. cit. pp. 47.

(2) Memorandum on the Minimum Wage, opp. cit. p. 17. Note: "The minimum comfort budget had never been previously described. The assumption is made that perhaps what were later called "subsistence" were at that time called "health" budgets. It is therefore not easy to determine the exact difference between the minimum comfort and the minimum health budgets." See: National Industrial Conference Board. Research Report No. 41, opp. cit. p. 43.

(3) Memorandum on the Minimum Wage, opp. cit. 18.

(4) ibid, opp. cit. p. 20.

in Washington in August, 1919. Experts were called in from various parts of the country to assist in the determination of what should be included in the budget and it was ascertained by agents of the Bureau who shopped in the Washington stores patronized by wage-earners.

Inasmuch as the primary aim was to furnish information for use by the Joint Reclassification Commission of Congress on Reclassification of Salaries, the minimum of health and decency and comfort was kept in mind when determining the quantity budget and in selecting qualities and ascertaining prices of articles of the budget. A great deal of difficulty was experienced in arriving at what was quantitatively meant by the phrases as "comfort", "reasonable comfort", etc. Finally the budget was constructed with the aim to provide for an average family consisting of husband, wife, and three children below the age of 14 years:

> "(1) A sufficiency of nourishing food for the maintenance of health, particularly the children's health;
>
> (2) Housing in low-rent districts and within the smallest possible number of rooms consistent with decency but with sufficient light, heat and toilet facilities for the maintenance of health and decency;
>
> (3) The upkeep of household equipment, such as kitchen utensils, bedding, linen, necessary for health, but with no provision for the purchase of additional furniture;
>
> (4) Clothing sufficient for warmth, of a sufficiently good quality to be economical, but with no further regard for appearance and style than is necessary to permit the family members to appear in public and within their rather narrow social circle without slovenliness or loss of self-respect;
>
> (5) A surplus over the above expenditures which would permit of only a minimum outlay for such necessary demands as;
>
> (*a*) Street car fares to and from work and necessary rides to stores and markets;
>
> (*b*) The keeping up of a modest amount of insurance;
>
> (*c*) Medical and dental care;
>
> (*d*) Contributions to churches and labour or beneficial organizations;
>
> (*e*) Simple amusements, such as the moving pictures once in a while, occasional street car rides for pleasure, some Christmas gifts for the children, etc.;
>
> (*f*) Daily newspaper."(1)

This was not intended as an ideal budget, but merely as a "bottom level of health and decency below which a family cannot go without danger of physical and moral deterioration." The budget does not include many comforts which should be included in a 'proper American standard of living'. Thus no provision is made directly for savings other than insurance, or for vacations or for books and other educational purposes. On the other hand, the Bureau maintains, "a family with the items listed in this budget should be able to maintain itself in health and modest comfort. It should have a sufficiency of food, respectable clothing, sanitary housing, and a minimum of essential "sundries." (2)

The Bureau in its report emphasized the fact, moreover, that "the maintenance of living on the level indicated does not necessarily require the receipt of an annual income of precisely this amount. Some families have less than three children, some have savings, from investment in a house or other income-yielding venture; many economies are possible through buying advantageously, through the ingenuity of the housewife in making clothes, planning meals, and the like. In these and other ways families may be able to keep up the decent

(1) Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget, op. cit. p. 6.
(2) ibid, op. cit. p. 7.

standard of living at a somewhat lesser cost than the market price of the budgetary items" (1). But the important thing is that the Bureau desired to indicate on the basis of quantities, qualities and services, what a 'proper' standard of living should be, and not in terms of dollars and cents. And while the Bureau provided information to Congress regarding the cost of living for government employees, it also furnished a list of the minimum amount of goods and services needed for an American family of five to maintain life at a level of "health and decency."

This "quantity budget" was universal in character, for it could be priced in any locality, and be made to apply, with necessary local modifications, to other wage-earning family groups. Thus in 1920, William F. Ogburn used it as the basis of the budget he presented for the United States Bituminous Coal Commission. He claimed that "what is a standard of health and decency for families of Government employees should in its main outlines also be the standard of health and decency for families of mine workers. The prices of the items may be different in the coal centres, there may be variations in the standard; the miners need more food and their clothing requirements may be different, but the main purpose borne in mind was—to determine a standard of living in coal mining communities necessary for health and decency, based on such determinations by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for Washington, D.C."(2).

Five hundred calories per day were added to the food allowance of the government employeee in Washington, in order to insure that the miner, presumably at heavier labor, was adequately fed.

Certain modifications were made in the man's clothing budget to meet the peculiar requirements of the bituminous miners; the clothing allowance for the woman and the three children were the same in the miners' families as in those for the families of the government employees in Washington. Housing, of course varied greatly in the different mining towns and the allowance varied accordingly. The cost of fuel, light and sundries was likewise a generalized average.

The cost for maintaining a standard of health and decency among bituminous miners' families, was, in January, 1920, $2,243.94. In sundries is included also $140 a year necessarily spent by many miners for explosives and tools The food allowance also took account of a saving of $15 annually from the market cost, because of the general prevalence of gardens and the keeping of chickens (3).

The costs of the items of this budget were obtained by agents of the Bureau of Labour Statistics, who collected prices in two bituminous mining towns, and also from records of the Bureau of Labour Statistics, showing the costs in additional communities. The budget therefore does not apply to any one locality (4)

After the Bureau of Labour Statistics had made its estimate of the quantity and cost of the goods and services required by the family of a government employee in Washington, this was revised to provide a similar quantity budget for a so-called workingman's family. Its purpose was to furnish a standard for an "accurate determination of the cost of maintaining a standard of health and decency for a workingman's family, and for a more accurate calculation of changes in the cost of living" (5). The workingman's family budget differed from the Washington clerical in minor details of food and clothing, which it was thought would doubtless about balance one another when measured in

(1) Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget, opp. cit. p. 8.
(2) "Standards of Living," op. cit. p. 58.
(3) ibid, p. 60. See also: United States. Bituminous Coal Commission. Award and Recommendations, Washington, 1920, p. 79.
(4) Family Budgets of American Workers. op. cit. p. 47.
(5) Monthly Labour Review, June, 1920, p. 1.

terms of dollars and cents (1). This budget has been used a number of times to determine the cost of living among specified groups of workers (2). The details of this budget will be discussed in a later chapter.

The importance of having accurate figures on the cost of living was early evident in Australia (3). When arbitration courts were established after 1900 the presiding judges had almost no statutory guidance in making awards; there was no definition of the basic wage and the judges in the New South Wales and the Commonwealth Court had to fix their own standards. In 1901 Mr. Justice Heydon in New South Wales declared: "every worker, however humble, shall receive enough to enable him to lead a human life, to marry, and bring up a family and maintain them and himself with at any rate some small degree of comfort". In 1907 Mr. Justice Higgins in the Harvester Case, laid down the basis of what he considered "fair and reasonable" conditions of pay, which should fulfil "the normal needs of the average employee regarded as a human being living in a civilized community". This basic or living wage, he declared must be obtained by all male adult workers; above this rate there may come the additions on account of skill or other considerations. The Higgin's 1907 declaration became the guide to other decisions, and in 1912 the South Australian Industrial Court was by statute not permitted to "order or prescribe wages which do not secure to the employee affected a living wage." The meaning of "living wage" was repeated as that laid down by Mr. Justice Higgins' 1907 declaration became the guide to other decisions, and in 1912 the man employed shall receive a wage, "based, not on the value of his work, but on his requirements as a man in a civilized community which has resolved that, so far as laws can do it, competition shall be no longer allowed to crush him into sweated conditions".

It became imperative to possess knowledge of what families used, spent, and what it costs to maintain a "fair and reasonable" standard of living. Mr. Justice Higgins had in 1907 endeavoured to study this question and make a possible estimate. To do this he secured information from nine housekeeping women who submitted their household budgets showing weekly expenditures on rent, groceries, bread, meat, milk, fuel, vegetables and fruit (4). The family of five was taken as typical. Clothing and miscellaneous items were not included. From this effort he estimated that 7s. a day should constitute the minimum wage and this sum was incorporated in the body of arbitration law.

By 1917 discontent arose on the part of labour and criticism was levelled generally at the Higgins' estimate, at the methods by which it was reached, its foundation, and the fact that only rent and food figures were the guide to cost of living estimated for a family. Therefore, in December, 1919, as a result of the election campaign policy of the Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, a Royal Commission was appointed to make the following inquiry:

> "(1) The actual cost of living at the present time, according to reasonable standards of comfort, including all matters comprised in the ordinary expenditure of a household, for a man, wife, and three children under fourteen years of age, and the several items and amounts which make up that cost;
>
> (2) The actual corresponding cost of living during each of the last five years;
>
> (3) How the basic wage may be automatically adjusted to the rise and fall from time to time of the purchasing power of the sovereign;

(1) Family Budgets of American Workers, op. cit. p. 48.
(2) This "Quantity Budget" was used by the Labour Bureau Inc., New York, in connection with wage arbitration in the printing trades in New York in the fall of 1920. See: Monthly Labour Review, February, 1921, pp. 61–66.
(3) Heaton, H. "Basic Principles in Australian Wage Regulation." The Economic Journal, Vol. xxxi, Sept. 1921. pp. 309–19.
(4) Heaton. H. The Economic Journal, op. cit. p. 311.

And Mr. Hughes promised that the government would
at the earliest possible date create effective machinery to give effect to these principles."

The inquiry was carried out in the following manner: Three representatives of employers and three of employees were appointed, and Mr. A. B. Piddington, K.C., Chief Commissioner of the Interstate Commission, was appointed chairman. The Commission conducted a searching inquiry lasting over eleven months. One hundred and fifteen public hearings were held in seven principal cities of the Commonwealth and about eight hundred witnesses were examined. In addition, six hundred exhibits of family schedules were received and an independent investigation was also carried out.

The basis of the inquiry was virtually Mr. Justice Higgins' "reasonable standard of comfort", which included "the normal needs of a human being in a civilized community" and had not reference to "any one type or group of employees, but to the needs which are common to all employees, following the accepted principle that there is a standard of living below which no employee should be asked to live".(1)

The findings of the Commission are detailed as follows:(2)

"(1) *Rent:* A five-roomed house, in good condition, on a fair allotment, in a respectable neighbourhood, and fitted with such obvious conveniences as bath, copper and wash-tubs.

(2) *Clothing:* For a man, his wife and three children, aged $10\frac{1}{2}$, 7 and $3\frac{1}{2}$ years.

The clothing allowance is in part—for the husband, two-thirds of a suit a year, plus two pairs of working trousers, an overcoat once in four years, two pairs of boots a year, plus a pair of shoes every two years For the wife, a hat every year, plus another cheaper hat every two years, one winter costume every three years, and one summer costume every three years, plus two skirts in three years, and approximately four blouses, and two pairs of shoes and a pair of slippers. Boot repairs for the family are allowed for, and cut-down garments by the mother for smaller members of the family, home sewing, and probably other savings are considered.

(3) *Food:* The generally accepted standard of 3,500 calories as necessary for the average male adult, and regarded the family of five as equal to 3.3 men, was adopted.

(4) *Miscellaneous:* An allowance of £5 a year for holidays as a means of lessening the strain upon the mother, and as a substitute for providing her with paid household assistance was made. Other miscellaneous items were: fuel and light, laundry and kitchen requisites, renewal of household linen, crockery, lodge and union dues, medical and dental care, amusements, recreation, and library, fares and school requisites.

The unions' claims for such items as insurance—unemployment and life—old-age annuity, church and charity, alcoholic and soft drinks, and tuition in music and art, were disallowed."

For the adjustment of basic wage as found by the inquiry, (in 1920, £5 16s.) to variations in the cost of living, the Commission recommended that a Bureau of Labour Statistics be established, whose duty it would be to record quarterly all alterations in the prices of the items included in the four sections

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on the Basic Wage, Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1920, p. 4.

(2) Heaton, H. Economic Journal, op. cit. p. 314–5. Also: Douglas, P. H., Quarterly Journal of Economics, "Wages Regulation in Australia," (Vol. 37, 1923 (pp. 668–669)).

adopted, and to declare the actual cost of living four times a year upon an average of prices during the four preceding quarters of the year. (1)

The basic wage as estimated by the Commission created a great deal of controversy; employers claiming that the amount set was ruinously high, while the trade unionists declared the employers' objections invalid. The gist of both these arguments are given in Chapter eight of this paper.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE BASIS OF A LIVING WAGE?

It is commonly agreed that there are various determinants of wages: supply and demand, productively, collective bargaining, and that all of these are variously interrelated. In a period of laissez-faire conditions, supply and demand operate strongly. But with the growth of social justice, the standard of living begins to play a large part in the determination of wages. This has been true particularly during the war when because of the increase in prices the necessity came for a high degree of social regulation and control. But on coming back to a period when such control are not considered to be so stringently necessary, it cannot be said that the standard of living becomes less important in the national consideration. If the standard of living is neglected in the determination of wages, then many social evils will continue to be bred in our society, the most devastating among which are "sweating", industrial warfare and unrest, forced pauperism and a train of subsidiary, though by no means minor effects.

The truth of this has been recognized by many thinkers and leaders in their country's affairs. The question then to be settled becomes: What should be the basis of a living wage? What standard of living is to be considered in the settlement of such a wage for workers? The following have been selected to give an indication of the variety of opinions expressed by representative and responsible individuals and agencies, as well as legal statutes.

In addition to the general statutory declarations, platform assertions, and individual opinion, there are the theories of investigators into the living conditions of work people, as to the proper line upon which to base wages. These latter range from the "poverty line," or "physical efficiency" of Rowntree to the "comfort level" of the Piexotto and Ogburn budgets, supplemented by the Quantity Budget of the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics in America. These have been reviewed in part in Chapter Two.

From the mass of effort to determine a just method of wage payment, how to assuage the insistent problems in the labour field, and, the most important of all, how to undermine the evident evils present in poverty conditions, has stepped one outstanding idea: In fairness to the social good and to the health of the race, remuneration for work and services should be guided by valid human needs.

What are these needs? Are they capable of being measured?

Mr. Seebohm Rowntree (2), whose investigations into this field are thorough and authentic, discusses these needs in his book "The Human Needs of Labour." He declares that it is not difficult to ascertain these; in the present day standards are devised with almost mathematical accuracy for all kinds of purposes, and it is possible to fix a standard of food and other human requirements. Nutriment, he states, may be provided in an infinite number of forms from the prison fare to the menu of a high class hotel. It is possible however to reduce all dietaries to a common denominator since they all consist of certain essential constituents. Chemical analysis in what proportion they are present in any foodstuff, no matter how complicated. If, therefore with the aid of information given by physiologists we can ascertain the amount of these essential constituents necessary to keep the body in good working order, it is

(1) Heaton, H. Economic Journal, op. cit. p. 315.
(2) Rountree, B. Seebohm: The Human Needs of Labor, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., London, and New York (1918).

comparatively easy to select suitable dietaries containing the required nutriment and to ascertain the cost of providing them.

Physiologists are scientifically certain in the information they offer; there is no vagueness about the knowledge of the requirements of the human body, the fuel it needs, the repair it must undergo on the wear and tear of the daily exertions (1).

The quantity of food that the body must assimilate is also accurately established, in terms of protein and potential energy. The potential energy of food is usually stated in heat units or calories (2), and the variations of the quantities according to the amount of muscular work performed. Since it is not quite possible to lay down a standard which would be right for every person it is usual to classify food requirements roughly according to whether the work is light, moderately hard, and very hard. The majority of physiologists in Germany, Denmark, Japan, and Sweden hold that in order to maintain physical efficiency, a diet must provide men engaged in work which is classified as moderately hard work, with approximately 3,500 calories of fuel energy. The amount may be less for those engaged in light work and more for those in hard work.

There are varying opinions as to the exact demarcations between degrees of light, moderate and hard work. Physiologists agree that a man engaged in light work, for example, a shop assistant, requires 2,500 calories; a man engaged in hard work, i.e. a blacksmith, a stoker, or coal-hewer, requires 4,500 calories; and a man engaged in exceptionally hard work, such as a lumberman, and who is exposed in all kinds of weather, requires much more—6,400 calories of fuel energy.

Mr. Rowntree goes on to classify the degrees of work intensity according to the character of work performed—agriculture, docking, builders, blacksmiths (under which is usually included machinists and labourers) loaders, and the various kinds of factory work (3). He concludes generally that: "there is any industry in which the proportion of men whose work could be considered as less than moderate would be sufficiently large to justify any reduction in the standard. And the physical effort involved in travelling home and to work must be borne in mind. This may not be paid for in wages, and not ordinarily counted as part of the day's work, the wear and tear of the body must be good, and this can only be done by food consumed" (4).

The Size of the Family

One other very important point in the fixing of food requirements of a class, Mr. Rowntree reminds us of: "When fixing the wages for a man it must be remembered that they must be such as will enable him to maintain a family during the years when the children are dependent on his earnings. The work of the wife cannot be regarded as of less moderate severity, and often would be defined as hard, when remembering that the work of a labourer's wife, with large families to look after and bring up, and the entire household work to perform . . . . The children constantly 'knock about', ... and it would therefore not be wise, to put the food requirements of the wives and children of the labouring classes any more than those of the men, at less than is needed by moderate workers" (5).

The budgets of the United States investigators, and that of the Bureau of Labour, base their food estimates on the requirements of those who perform

(1) Rountree, op. cit. 52, ff.
(2) ibid, op. cit. pp. 57–9.
(3) ibid, op. cit. pp. 64, ff.
(4) Rountree, op. cit. pp. 66–7.
(5) ibid, op. cit. pp. 67–8.

moderate work. The investigations carried out in Australia by the Basic Wage Commission were guided similarly.

Since these requirements are calculated for the use of a family, the question arises: what size of family? How can an average family be found to serve as a type or standard for these calculations? The investigations in this subject carried out by Mr. Rowntree show that in York, where he carried on his survey, half the men had three or more children simultaneously dependent on them for shorter or longer periods. Nearly one-half (46.4 per cent) have three or more dependent children for at least five years (1). To what extent conditions in York may be regarded as typical of the country as a whole, Mr. Rowntree shows by the birth and death rates in York, which approximate very nearly to those for the entire country, and that at the date of the 1911 census, the average number of children under fourteen per household was 1.7 in York which is exactly the average number of children for the whole country.

The investigations into family standards and cost of living carried out in the United States disclose the following with regard to the average size of families: The investigation made by the United States Bureau of Labour in 1900-1902, of 25,440 families, showed 4.88 persons. Families whose head was native born averaged 4.67 persons and foreign families, 5.18 persons. The 11,156 so-called "normal" families selected for special study, averaged 3.96 persons per family. The 2,567 special families selected in this study, averaged 5.31 persons. The investigation carried out by the British Board of Trade in 29 American cities, found that the average size of the family among the wage-earners' groups studied was 4.9 persons, including boarders; but children living at home and not rated as boarders averaged 2.8 per family. The result of the investigation carried out by the United States Bureau of Labour in 35 communities in 1918-19, of 12,096 white families, showed an average of 4.9 persons per family. Mrs. More's study of unselected families (i.e. unselected as to size of family or amount of income) gives an average size of 5.6 persons, but this is not a fair estimate, since her "family" includes boarders, children at work, minor children, and other dependents. Mr. Chaplin's study was made only of families having not less than four and not more than six persons. The study of Homestead families by Miss Byington showed an average of 4.4 persons in the family, exclusive of boarders. The study of the southern cotton mill communities carried out by the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, showed an average of 7 persons per family exclusive of boarders and lodgers. The survey in the Chicago stockyards gives 5.33 persons to the family exclusive of boarders and lodgers. The New York State Factory Investigating Commission found that the average family numbered about 5 persons. Data collected from 1,481 while families and 629 coloured families in the District of Columbia showed that the average size of the white families was 4.9 persons, including boarders and lodgers; the "net" family, excluding boarders and lodgers, even though they might be older children, averaged 3.8 persons. The investigation of 260 families made by the Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, showed an average of 5.04 persons, exclusive of boarders and lodgers. Studies carried out by the United States Coal Commission of families in the anthracite mining communities showed that of these miners who maintained homes, 55.7 per cent had three or more children (2).

Whether these investigations can be taken as reliable enough sources for information on the average family is to-day debated (3). But, failing more

---

(1) ibid, pp. 34–5.
(2) United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 369, May 1925, p. 437.
(3) Douglass, Paul H.: Wages and the Family. University of Chicago Press, 1925, p.

accurate sources (1) these findings have to-day been adopted by all who make researches into the cost of living for a family, or wish to determine a fair standard of living for an average family.

From the knowledge gained through these researches, the composition of the average family has been generally agreed upon as being five persons: father, mother, and three children under fourteen years of age, and dependent upon the earnings of the father. With this agreement, the dietary of such families has been set by dietitians and food experts with fair accuracy, and the needs of man, woman, and children of varying ages have been quantitatively and qualitatively measured (2).

Clothing, housing, household and general sundries as well as fuel have been considered as difficult to establish set standards. It is true of course that into these realms enter in personal taste, individual desires to exclude or include certain things, to sacrifice one thing for another. But there are those fundamental requirements of a human being upon which there can be no disagreement. These fundamentals may be described as follows:

Clothes serve both as protection and adornment. And the material of clothes should not be made merely to protect workers from the inclemencies of the seasons, but should also possess some features of adornment, or what is called "style". It is true that there is no standard in style, that here the fancy of the individual enters in. Nevertheless, this is not wholly true; and few men and women desire to appear among their kind or in public in clothes that do not conform as closely as possible to the *general* prevailing mode. There are therefore undeniable possibilities to set out in detail just what may be agreed upon as fundamental in clothing requirements of a standard or average working class family.

In the matter of shelter, or housing for the family, Mr. Rowntree says: "If physical efficiency is to be maintained, houses must be dry, well drained, and capable of being properly heated" (3). Mr. Royal Meeker, former Commissioner of Labour in the United States: "The housing experts can now lay down reasonably approximate standard requirements for housing the typical family of husband, wife, and three children under fourteen years. The barest minimum calls for a dwelling of not less than four rooms, if such family are to live in decency and health (4). According to the British official census, overcrowding begins where there are two or more persons per room (5). The family should have a kitchen-dining room, a living room which can be used as a sleeping room by one of the children, and two large, well-ventilated and lighted bedrooms" (6), Mr. Rowntree states with regard to the number of rooms: ". . . for a family of five there must be at least a fair-sized living room, a scullery-kitchen, a dining room, and from two or three bedrooms, and preferably, a bath. . ." (7).

---

(1) "The census figures of population offer no guidance for the determination of an average family either in the United States or in Canada. If for example, we were to take the 105,000,000 of population in the United States, and divide this figure by 24,000,000 families, an average of 4·3 persons to the family is obtained; this does not, however, represent the size of wage-earning class families, for in these figures are included families which have large incomes and small families of a few children. Moreover, the term 'family' as used in the census signifies a group of persons whether related by blood or not, who live together as one household, usually sharing the same table. One person living alone is counted as a family, and, on the other hand, all occupants and employees of a hotel, boarding house, or lodging house, if that is their usual place of abode, and all the inmates of an institution, however numerous, are treated as constituting a single family." See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bulletin No. 369, May, 1925, p. 437.

(2) Professor M. E. Jaffa, of the University of California, says: "Foods which form the suggested dietary of working class families may be separated into five groups: (1) The protein group; (2) the starchy group; (3) the fruits and vegetables, to maintain mineral balance; (4) the fats, giving heat and energy; (5) the sugars, whose concentrated source of energy is necessary for those who need heat—more particularly children, or for those whose work makes large demands on fuel supply."

(3) Rowntree, op. cit. pp. 95, ff.

(4) U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics. Monthly Labour Review, January, 1919, p. 5.

(5) idem, July, 1919, p. 7.

(6) Monthly Labour Review, January, 1919, pp. 5–6.

(7) Rowntree, op. cit. p. 96.

The amount of fuel required for cooking and for heating the standard four or five roomed house can be stated approximately in terms of British thermal units, though the amount and the kind of the fuel required varies in different geographical locations.

For the other items that constitute a full family budget there are not such approximate and recognized standards of measurement. But as in clothing, so in the quality and quantity of household furnishings, in cleaning supplies, in insurance and health protection, conclusions can be drawn from information secured as to what working class families, which have had sufficient opportunity to have regard for these things, have secured. There is general agreement also among people of reliable judgment, as to what constitutes human necessities in these branches of the family needs.

In furniture and furnishings there are some items without which no home can, in the light of modern ideas of the 'decencies,' be deprived of: table, chairs, beds, bedcoverings, bureaux, stoves, utensils. The variations here enter in the quality and style of the articles; but here also judgment as to what constitutes true economy can act as guide in the choice.

Of the miscellaneous items by far the most important in its bearing upon the family's health and welfare is medical services. No sufficient information yet exists upon which to base an exact estimate as to the kinds and quantities of medical services required by the typical family, and the costs of such services. Information as gathered from study of family budgets, afford no criterion by which to judge the adequacy of the treatment received. Some of the health insurance companies of the country have gathered information about the amount of sickness of workingmen's families, but the general amount of money spent per year has not yet been accounted.(1) But it cannot be disagreed with that a sufficient allowance must be made for this important part of the family's expenditures, and that the working man and his family should be able to look after their health needs in an independent and dignified manner. The worker who is not able to pay the necessary price for the medical, surgical, hospital, and dental services needed by himself and his family, has to resort to the community or the subsidized hospital which give him these necessary services free or below cost. The result is, as these institutions and services are organized at the present day, indifferent medical and hospital service, and municipal or subsidized service bestowed on such people not as the just and recognized due of a citizen and a worker, but as charity handed out by a benevolent community or by private philanthropists. This is both unjust and harmful to the personality, oftentimes also to the health of the workers and their families who are driven to resort to such medical aid. Mr. Meeker comments on this, declaring that "workers who are driven by dire necessity to make use of the free wards in hospitals or outdoor clinics, either learn to hate and distrust all hospitals and medical men because they are not given proper treatment, or they become partially or wholly hospitalized because they survive the treatment meted out to them and rapidly learn to like the carbonized atmosphere of our hospital almshouses" (2). The important consideration is that the workingman's family must be in a position to take care of its health requirements and not to depend on the modern charity system of hospital service, which strikes not only at the physical welfare of the family, but at its sense of self-respect.

Ranking in importance with medical aid, stands insurance. In modern life provision against the hazards of accident, sickness, invalidity, old age, unemployment, and death is just as necessary as medical service and even as

(1) U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, Monthly Labour Review, January, 1919, p. 6.
(2) United States Bureau of Labour Statistics. Monthly Labour Review. July, 1919, p. 11.

food. From a study of American family budgets (1) it was found that not very many of these had protection against such hazards, with the exception of death. It has been found by investigators that the possibilities to secure adequate insurance on any one of these hazards outside the accident of death, is barely possible for workers (2). For one thing insurance companies do not offer appreciable protection in these matters, and for another, the cost of buying such insurance is prohibitive to the average worker. As a result those hazards which occur the most often and disastrously in the worker's life,—unemployment, sickness, accident (not covered by existing compensation legislation) and old age, are purely neglected. How shall workingmen secure adequate insurance? and what shall be deemed adequate insurance? Mr. Meeker in his analysis of workers' expenditures on insurance concludes:

> "(1) I see no possibility of workingmen securing sufficient insurance protection until we come to the only sane and sensible way of conducting the communal business of insurance—as a community affair for the benefit of the community as a whole—by eliminating private competitive profit-taking from this business and making it universal in its application.
>
> (2) Pending the enactment of such laws, we must conclude that in the standard budgets an amount of life insurance for the head of the family sufficient to tide the family over a period of at least one year in case the breadwinner should die. This does not appear to be an extravagant margin of safety for the family" (3). The writer is in agreement with the Commissioner's remarks, and agrees further when he states: the standard budgets should provide for weekly benefits in case of disability from sickness or accident, large enough to enable the life of the family to be carried on without any serious fall in the standard of living. A like degree of protection should be afforded in case of invalidity and old age and unemployment" (4).

The recreation and amusements of the family are as of profound importance as food and other requirements. These are even more difficult to measure in quantity or quality. "One man's meat is another man's drink; amusement is largely psychical—Tom Sawyer elevated fence whitewashing from the lowest form of menial drudgery to the most popular outdoor sport in his home town. But in every country there are certain general forms of recreation, and in these the mass of the workers indulge—moving pictures, dance-entertainments, excursions, picnics, etc. For these some standard allowance can be made. As well as for other known details of home economy.

Thus for the guidance of wage adjustors in arriving at just wage awards, consumption standards for almost every item of family wants have been set. And such standards have been promulgated as will insure healthful living to the families of wage earners.

The most complete standard budget for a family of five has, to the writer's knowledge, been constructed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nearly 300 agents were engaged on the study in the field, and domestic scientists and social workers of the country formulated the tentative standards of quantity and quality. This standard budget is discussed in the following chapter.

---

(1) Idem, July, 1919, p. 10.
(2) U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, Bulletin No. 93, "Cost of Living in the United States," May, 1924.
(3) Monthly Labour Review, op. cit. p. 7.
(4) Ibid, op. p. 7.

A STANDARD OF HEALTH AND DECENCY

To the general public the determination of a level of subsistence seems a matter of opinion rather than of science. But indeed there are many scientific approaches to the problem and various ways of eliminating the personal bias. Some of these methods have been described above and it has been indicated that food, clothing, housing and miscellaneous requirements can be fairly closely estimated.

Formerly budgets determining standards of living were expressed in terms of price only. But during the war when prices were changing so rapidly and when the cost of living rose over 100 per cent in six or seven years, we have seen the fallacy of attempting to define a living wage or a standard of living on the basis of the money cost. Money has fluctuated, but throughout the years there has been no change in the size of a quart of milk, a pound of butter, or of a dozen of eggs, and the nourishment required for the human body. The "hunger satisfaction" derived from these has not changed. Obviously there must be other means by which to express human needs than in money. This need has now been fulfilled by the method of interpreting human requirements in terms of quantity and quality of commodities as well as price. Quantity can be the only language in which a living wage or a standard of living can be discussed or defined.

To determine the quantity and the quality of commodities and the grounds for their necessity, there must be a criterion from which to judge. Of all that have yet been offered there is no criterion that serves the purpose better than that of health.(1) It is unquestionable that health is the right of every man, woman and child. Health may be justly adopted as a criterion for a living wage and a decent standard of living. No matter how indifferent an employer may be towards the personal happiness of his employees, he nevertheless looks with favour on a healthy workman and a healthy community.

The definition of such a standard is best contained in a statement of those quantities of family consumption which are found necessary in maintaining families in health. Such a statement is called a commodity budget. This can be fairly accurately arrived at by studying the quantities and kinds of articles and services actually consumed by families which are maintaining themselves at a level of health.

Such a quantity budget the Bureau of Labour Statistics was able to construct through a country-wide survey of the cost of living conducted during 1918 and 1919 (2). The study was planned for the following purposes:—

"(*a*) To determine the cost of all important items of family consumption in all the important industrial centers in the United States.

(*b*) To apply the accepted dietary standards for determining whether the families studied were obtaining a sufficient number of calories and sufficient variety in their diets to maintain their members in health.

(*c*) To work out, if possible, standards—similar to the recognized dietary standards—clothing, housing, fuel, house furnishings, education, amusement, medical care, insurance, and perhaps some other items which have hitherto been blanketed and lost under the term 'miscellaneous.'

(*d*) To formulate eventually, tentative standard budgets to be used by wage adjustment boards in determining minimum and fair wage awards.

(*e*) To enable the Bureau of Labour Statistics to compute a cost of living index number that will show variations in total family expenses in the same way as the retail food price index shows variations in the cost of the family food budget."

(1) Kittredge, Dorothea Davis: A suggestion for determining a living wage. American Economic Review, June, 1923, pp. 225–229.

(2) Monthly Labor Review, U.S. Department of Labour, May to August, 1919.

25868—6½

More than 300 agents were employed by the Bureau to secure from housewives statements of their expenditures for an entire year. The information thus secured for the entire year by personal interview was later checked in many instances by daily expense accounts which many housewives were prevailed upon to keep over a period of not less than five weeks. These daily expense accounts were especially useful in checking up expenditures for food and other articles bought daily or weekly and easily forgotten ordinarily.

Nearly 13,000 family schedules were obtained in 71 large cities and 26 small cities and towns in the different geographical sections of the country, for incomes ranging from less than $900 to more than $2,500 annually per family. The actual expenses for the different items were tabulated by income groups. The cost and the quantity of all the important items of the family budget were this arraigned. The quantity bought was the essential for working out the standard budget and not the amount of money expended. The data showing the expenditures were grouped under six divisions: Food, clothing, housing, fuel and light, furniture and furnishings, and miscellaneous items. Each group was subdivided into a number of items in order to show as specifically as possible just what articles were purchased.

In the selection of the families to be included, the following requirements were set out:

"(*a*) The family must be that of a wage earner or salaried worker, but not of a person in business for himself. These families should represent proportionally the wage earners and the low or medium salaried families in the locality.

(*b*) The family must have a minimum, a husband, wife and at least one child who is not a boarder or lodger.

(*c*) The family must have kept house in the locality for the entire year covered.

(*d*) At least 75 per cent of the family income must come from the principal breadwinner or others who contribute all earnings to the family fund.

(*e*) All items of income and expenditure of members other than those living as lodgers must be obtainable.

(*f*) The family may not have boarders nor over three lodgers either outsiders or children living as such. (This does not refer to or include, relatives, servants, nurses, temporarily in the home who were furnished board free.)

(*g*) The family must have no subrental other than furnished rooms for lodgers.

(*h*) Slum or charity families, or non-English speaking families who have been less than five years in the United States should not be taken."

The survey was made during 1918-1919, when prices were abnormal, and when the cost of foods had reached a peak, and workers had necessarily to curtail their expenditures. The results of the Bureau's investigation is taken as showing strictly minimum amounts for the maintenance of a family, and as representing what the worker could afford not necessarily what he and his family needed.(1) Of the adequacy of the amounts found in the budgets collected, Mr. Royal Meeker, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labour Statistics, says, "It is in many respects unfortunate that the study was made during 1918-1919 when prices were abnormal, resulting in abnormalities in expenditure, and when such stress had to be laid upon the necessity of investing in Liberty Bonds. The result was an unusually large savings reported and abnormally low expenditures for other items. Many families not only economized on clothes and house furnishings, but actually skimped themselves on food both because of the high prices and because of the intense liberty loan drives."(2)

(1) Cost of Living Survey, Portland, Oregon. Reed College Bulletin. January, 1925, Vol. 4, No. 1.
(2) U.S. Monthly Labor Review, July, 1919, p. 2: "What is an American Standard of Living"? By Royal Meeker.

The Size of the Family

The budget is constructed for a family of five—consisting of husband, wife, and three dependent children—a boy of 11, a girl of 5, and a boy of 2 years of age. This type of family has been used by the Bureau and by other investigators in similar studies. A family of this particular size and composition, it has been found, represents actual existing families in the United States as found by the country-wide survey. The average number in the white families scheduled by the Bureau was 4.9 individuals (equivalent to 3.33 adult males) which corresponds very closely with the standard of five individuals, (equivalent to 3.35 adult males). The ages of the children are an assumption, arbitrary and solely for the purpose of making precise calculations as to food and clothing consumption. The children in this standard family are growing children, not yet able to add anything to the family income and not so expensive to maintain as they will become later on. The standard family is about half way between the family with no children and the family with grown children capable of self-support.

The "Standard" Food Budget

From the data gathered in this survey and with the aid both of experience in former investigations, the aggregate of which included several times the number of families represented in this single study, and the dietitian of the United States Bureau of Agriculture and the National Conference of Social Work, the Bureau made two distinct studies of food budgets. 280 families were selected from the approximately 13,000 families scheduled. This small group of families was chosen because of the average size of the family, which was approximately that of the average workman, and because their food budgets conformed very closely in food values represented, with the scientifically determined requirements of the families. An especially careful study was made of the food budgets of these 280 families, for the purpose of obtaining a standard budget that would represent adequate nourishment for the family.

In the determination of a proper family dietary two standards were assumed at the beginning:

> (1) A standard food requirement in calories per man per day; (2) A standard table giving the food-consuming capacity of women and children in terms of a common unit—the equivalent adult male.

In answer to the first assumption, the Bureau reports: (1)

> "Various scientific students of food have estimated that the number of calories needed by a man at moderately hard muscular work is 3,500 calories per day. It is calculated that a family usually wasted about 10 per cent of the caloric value of food in preparation, cooking, etc. and a small per cent of the food which enters the mouth is not digested or assimilated. Therefore, 3,500 calories purchased represents approximately 3,100 to 3,200 calories actually consumed by the body. Experience indicates that it is necessary to purchase this amount of food per man per day in order to insure sufficient variety and quantity both as to bulk and calorie content. If the housewife is a dietetic genius, 3,500 calories per man per day purchased in the market may be a liberal allowance."

In defining the second standard assumed, the Bureau states, "The relative proportions of the food consumed by the husband, wife and children have been determined approximately by laboratory experiments and by estimates taking into account factors of age, sex, weight, occupation and activity. For the sake of brevity the following table of equivalent adult males has been found practic-

(1) United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, Monthly Labour Review. June, 1920, p. 1.

able and sufficiently accurate for the purpose of this budget and adopted by the Bureau:

Male, 15 years and over	1.00
Female, 15 years and over	.90
Children, 11 to 14 years	.90
Children, 7 to 10 years inclusive	.75
Children, 4 to 6 years inclusive	.40
Children under 4 years	.15

On this basis the following food budget has been drawn up for a family of five. The calorie requirements of a man is taken as 1; that of a woman, 0.9; of a boy of 12, 0.9; of a girl of 6, 0.4; and a boy of 2 years, 0.15. The combined food requirements of this family would be equal to that of 3.35 adult males.(1)

As explained above, the food budget used here was obtained from a careful analysis of selected 280 families, who represented about 25 cases from each of 11 cities. The quantity submitted here represents the actual amounts of foods used by the families selected. Their budgets were also carefully considered from the standpoint of health. For the most part these average budgets contained proteins, fats, carbohydrates in sufficient quantities and in the right proportions. To make them acceptable to trained dietitians as a standard budget intended to maintain the standard family in health, it was necessary only to reduce slightly the quantity of meat and to increase slightly the quantities of whole milk, fresh vegetables and fruits. Below is a comparison of the foods represented on this average budget with the minimum standards generally accepted by scientific students of the subject.

OUNCES OF FOOD CONSUMED PER MAN PER DAY (2)

—	Meat	Fish	Dairy	Milk	Cereals	Vegetables	Fruits	Fats	Sugars
Average of 280 families...	5·6	0·9	15·5	12·1	15·1	17·6	5·8	2·1	2·7
Standard.....	4 or 5	2	16	11 or 12	12	16 or 20	16 or 20	2	2

The proposed food budget submitted therefore includes the kinds and, in a large measure, the quantities of food actually consumed by actual workingmen's families. It has not been worked out by "experts" in the secrecy of the laboratory. It is made up of things which real people eat day by day throughout the year (3).

The budget as a whole consists of 5,961 pounds of food (dry weight) per year, or approximately 115 pounds per week for the family. About 100 pounds per week are articles of food of a more or less staple character which may be purchased at any season of the year. As a guide to buying, or to serve as a check against quantities ordinarily purchased, the weekly quantities of the actual articles of food embraced have been segregated into the following groups: (1) year-round foods, which total about 100 pounds of food; (2) special summer foods, which average about 7.6 pounds; (3) those which will probably be

(1) U.S. Department of Labour, Monthly Labour Review, June, 1920, p. 2.
(2) Ibid, op. cit. p. 3.
(3) The Bureau hastens to add "that because it was found that these selected workingmen's families ate sufficient food of about the proper kind, it must therefore not be inferred that no improvement can be suggested in the workingmen's diet. Only those families were included in the special food analysis whose diets measured up to the calorie requirements of sound dietetics. Had the food budgets of all families been averaged together, the showing would have been quite different." Monthly Labour Review (June, 1920), p. 4. "Tentative Quantity Budget Necessary to Maintain a Worker's Family of Five in Health and Decency."

used in the winter season when the price of fresh fruits prohibits their purchase; these average about 6.1 pounds per week. These averages are based on 52 weeks in the year, and in order to ascertain the quantities per week of the season—approximately 26 weeks—in which these seasonal foods are to be used, the Bureau advises it will be necessary to practically double the listed quantities of winter and summer season foods (1).

A summary of the complete food budget is given in the Appendix, Table 1.

Clothing Budget (2)

The level of health and decency in clothing has been interpreted in the standard budget as a level which not only takes into account the physical needs but which also has such regards for appearance and style as will permit the family members to appear in public, and within their necessarily rather narrow social circle, with neatness and self-respect. While admitting the desirability of a more generous wardrobe, an effort was made by the Bureau to allow only those quantities of clothing which would be consistent with the *minimum* requirement for health and decency, and, where a doubt has existed, to err on the side of conservatism.

This clothing budget has as its basis the clothing budgets of approximately 850 families having three children under fifteen years of age, which were included in the survey of the Bureau in 1918-19, in Washington, D.C., and which has since been modified to apply to the manual worker's family. Like the food budget the clothing budget is made up of the articles actually worn by real workers and their families. The modifications in the standard clothing budget are more extensive than were made in the food budget. The articles of clothing are the same both in the actual and in the standard budget, but the quality of the material and the yearly replacements in the latter have been determined largely by special study.

The quantities listed in the clothing budget are the *annual replacements*, and not the number of garments to be possessed at any one time. For example, in the husband's clothing budget the annual replacement of a summer suit is given as one-third, which means that one summer suit is expected to last three years. Allowance is made for the purchase of two sets of winter underwear. He may actually have six or any other number of sets, but with reasonable care, he can manage comfortably by purchasing two suits a year. Allowance has been made for the purchase of only two pairs of work trousers or overalls; this is on the assumption that every 18 months on the average the workingman will be able to supplement his work clothes with one suit of discarded "dress up" clothes. For this reason the purchase of two suits of clothes in three years has been allowed, and assuming again that the workingman's "Sunday" clothes are not subjected to very hard use, these suits when ready for every-day wear may reasonably be expected to form the major part of his work clothing, and in that event not more than two additional pairs of work trousers will be required each year. Since suit coats usually outwear the trousers, no separate coats to wear with the work trousers have been deemed necessary. No quantitative allowances have been made for raincoats, slippers, bathrobes, purse, repairs to watch, or any other item of clothing expense which occurs occasionally. A lump sum of money equivalent to about 7 per cent of the total cost of the husband's clothing has been allowed to cover purchases of this character.

---

(1) "In listing these foods and the average weekly quantities, it is not the intention of the Bureau to recommend that the housewife who buys food for a family of five should attempt to secure either these exact foods or the specified quantities. The articles or the quantities will necessarily have to be treated with a large degree of elasticity." Monthly Labour Review (June, 1920), p. 8.

(2) Minimum Quantity Budget Necessary to Maintain a Worker's Family of Five in Health and Decency, Monthly Labor Review (June, 1920), pp. 8–12.

Since this is distinctly a health and decency budget, little provision has been made for fashionable dress. No allowance has been made for an afternoon dress of silk, silk petticoats, or silk stockings; a wool dress, a suit skirt with a dress waist, a Venetian cloth or sateen petticoat, and lisle or cotton stockings are considered as absolutely essential to health and decency. Two new house dresses are to be purchased only, on the assumption that the old summer dresses of previous seasons are worn as everyday house dresses. Otherwise it is conceded that this allowance may prove inadequate. To care for the many purchases of "extras" such as dress shields, hair nets, hairpins, hand bag, combs, slippers, thread, buttons, etc., a lump sum of money of about 8.5 per cent of the total cost of the clothing for the wife has been approved of.

The clothing needs for the growing children presented a problem. The Bureau considers that a reasonably generous budget allowance has been made for the children, and it is expected that some clothing will be handed down and made over for the younger children, so as to get along on the amounts specified. In the families visited by the Bureau's agents, it was found to be general that the serious drain on the family's finances were the expenses for the children's shoes and stockings. The budget allows the following purchases in shoes for the children: For the boy of 12, three pairs of high shoes and two of low, every three years, with one repairing of half soles and heels for each of the five pairs. For the girls of 6, three pairs of high and two of low are allowed; for the boy of 2 years, two pairs of high shoes and two of sandals. In the case of the younger children, shoe repairing is not considered feasible and provision has not been made for it.

A considerable amount of sewing at home has been assumed as possible, and indicated in the clothing list. When more than the specified amount is done, a saving may be affected or the family be clothed more abundantly. But on the other hand, it is maintained, where little or no home sewing is done, the number of garments allowed will be barely sufficient to maintain decency.(1)

It is expected that variations in climate and individual taste to some degree, will make many changes and adjustments necessary for families. Occupational requirements also enter into the clothing budget of the husband especially; all of which considerations are not possible in the preparation of so general a budget, which is more indicative of a minimum standard, than a guide to the kinds of purchases to be made, although the annual replacements for each member of the family have been divided into year-round, summer and winter clothing in the clothing list.

Housing(2)

It is considered that a housing standard based upon health requirements must consider primarily air space, ventilation, lighting, sanitation, privacy, and proper separation of the sexes. In applying these requirements to particular dwellings, the factors to be taken into account are the number of rooms, per person, sanitary conveniences, floor space, window space, location and frontage. The standard suggested is for urban industrial communities and conforms quite closely to actual housing conditions existing in industrial centres of the country.

(1) *Number of Rooms:* The survey of the Bureau in 1918-19 showed that the majority of workingmen's families included in the schedules, lived in houses which furnished approximately one room per person. These were all primarily American families, since no schedules were taken from non-English speaking families who had not been in the United States for less than five years. Families with boarders or more than three lodgers were also excluded.

(1) Note: The investigations of the Bureau show that during the war clothing purchases of the average workers' family were considerably curtailed; that when it is necessary to economize the expense of clothes may be greatly reduced for a season or two, but if allowed to become depleted, the renewal of them creates a serious situation in the family finances. Monthly Labor Review, June 1920, op. cit. p. 9.

(2) Ibid, op. cit. pp. 13–15

For the average family of five persons therefore it is considered a house of five rooms, consisting of living room, dining room, kitchen and two bedrooms should be provided as the minimum for health and decency. For the standard family composed of husband, wife and three children under 14 years, boy aged 12, girl aged 6, and boy 2, three sleeping rooms are needed in order to secure reasonable privacy—one for the parents and two for the children, one for each sex. Various arrangements to supply the extra sleeping room may be had to turn the living room into it at the desired time.(1)

2. *Size of Rooms:* For purposes of health floor space is as important or more even than the number of rooms. The following sizes are suggested(2):

	Minimum size
Large bedroom	10 by 12 feet
Small bedroom	8 by 10 feet
Living room	10 by 12 feet
Dining room	9 by 12 feet
Kitchen (where there is no separate dining rm.)	10 by 12 feet

In the matter of light and ventilation the requirements are that every room is to have at least one window opening directly to the outer air; two windows in each generally are preferred, and one window is deemed sufficient in small bedrooms. Each room is to have a window area of not less than 12 square feet. There should be cross ventilation as direct as possible for all rooms through windows, or doors or transoms. And every bathroom should have a window of about 6 square feet in area opening directly to the outer air.

With regard to sanitation, it is considered that for the safeguarding of health and decency a house must include a complete bathroom, with toilet. And such drainage should be provided as will render stagnant pools on the premises, or the collection of water in the cellar or underneath the house, impossible.

In construction a house should be in compliance with housing laws, local building codes, and ordinances. The roof must be water tight, and the walls substantially and durably constructed so as to resist heat and moisture, according to the climatic conditions of the locality. And furthermore, accepting the constructural standards laid down by the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, the standard house should provide for the closet or storage space. The halls, stairs and doors should be so constructed and located as to permit of easy moving of the furniture. Porches or verandahs are highly desirable, and should be durably constructed; these may be made to serve as an additional sleeping room all the year round in some places.

It is also presumed that the standard house for the workingman's family will be located in a neighbourhood with reasonably well maintained streets, and fairly accessible to means of transportation, playgrounds, and places of amusement and recreation. What is commonly termed a "slum," is not considered as being the proper neighbourhood surroundings for a house intended to provide the minimum requirements of health and decency (3).

It has not been found possible to lay down specifications for any special forms of heating the standard workingman's house. Here there is such a wide range of means. Whatever the method of heating, it should be such as to

(1) Monthly Labor Review, June, 1920, p. 13.

(2) The size of the rooms were adopted by the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation of the Department of Labor, which undertook the war housing of the Government, other than that required for shipbuilders. See Monthly Labor Review (June, 1920), p. 13.

The standards for the different rooms in detached, semi-detached, flat, or row houses and represent the combined judgment of 25 architects, sanitary inspectors, builders and students of housing. The above specifications are given rather as a guide rather than requisition that these only are the sizes to be adopted in the housing standard.

(3) Monthly Labour Review, June, 1920. pp. 14–15.

permit of heating the principal living room to a temperature of 68° F. in the coldest weather in any given locality.(1)

Nor is it any more possible to offer quantity standards in lighting the house. This depends perhaps more upon what is locally available, as is also the case with fuel, and upon the character and equipment of the house.

Furniture etc.: In constructing a quantity budget for the upkeep of household, the Bureau of Labour Statistics has offered the first one to be established. This consists of a list of furniture, furnishings, and utensils necessary to equip completely a house of five rooms: living, dining, kitchen and two bedrooms occupied by the standard family of five persons. The list of articles, with brief descriptions is given in the Appendix.

This budget is said by the Bureau to assume the existence of an equipment of household furniture similar to the articles listed, and allowance is made merely for annual upkeep of such a supply. The Bureau reached conclusions as to the amount necessary for the annual upkeep of such equipment, from a study of 100 schedules showing one year's expenditure for furniture and furnishings, which were secured by the Bureau in 1918-19 from families consisting of five persons similar to the standard family, size, living in large Eastern or Middle Western cities, and having a total annual expenditure of $1,500 and under $2,100.(2) From this study it has been decided to allow seven per cent for the annual upkeep of equipment, after the articles on the list have been priced at the current retail prices.(3)

Miscellaneous: In a number of items a quantity standard has been laid down, as follows:

(1) *Cleaning Supplies and Services:*

	Annual Quantity
(*a*) Personal: Small bar toilet soap	90
Toothbrush	5
Toothpaste, tube or box	12
Combs, hard rubber	1
Hairbrush	½
Shoe polish, box	6
Barber's services:	
Husband, haircut	12
Children's haircut	8
(*b*) Household: Laundry soap, ½-lb. bar	150
Starch, pound	6
Cleanser, box	36
Small lump sum for unspecified cleaning supplies, such as borax, ammonia, washing powder, insect powder, bluing, etc., etc.	

(2) *Laundry Work:* From the standpoint of health, the Bureau deems that the mother of three children, who must do the cooking for the family, the general cleaning of the house, the sewing and mending, the marketing and shopping, should be allowed assistance with the laundry work and scrubbing amounting to one day per week, totalling $104 per year.

---

(1) The Bureau advises that such system of heating a house as are obtained by the use of small open grates in houses without double walls or air spaces, as exist in States far north as Pennsylvania, and as were found in company houses, would not be in compliance with the desired standard. See Monthly Labour Review, June, 1920, p. 15.

(2) It is considered that inasmuch as the families studied spent annually from $1,500 to $2,100 they were presumably living at a fairly decent and healthful standard.

(3) The total cost of furniture thus arrived at is not deemed as of use in determining a quantity standard, but is offered as a guide to the amount which should be allowed in the budget. M. L. R., June, 1920, p. 18.

(3) *Maintenance of Health:* This item includes expenditures for physician, dentist, oculist, glasses, drugs, including prescriptions and prepared remedies. No definite number of doctor's visits are assumed, nor can they be; but aside from major illnesses, it is considered that colds, and the various illnesses of childhood will make a doctor's visits and services necessary at some time during the year. The Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget (August, 1919, M.L.R.) allows a straight amount of $70.

(4) *Insurance:* (*a*) Life—a $5,000 policy is allowed for the head of the family, and is considered as the absolute minimum for protection and safety. The Bureau supplement this allowance with the opinion that for more adequate protection the workingman should carry at least a policy of $7,500.

(*b*) *Furniture:* at $1.50 per year, is absolutely necessary, since the loss of household equipment becomes an extremely serious matter to a family of low income. In fact the Bureau advocates that the budget should provide for a premium on a policy large enough to cover the replacement cost of the family's essential personal property in case of loss by fire.

(5) *Carfare.*—The quantitative standard for street carfare must largely be determined by the local method of transportation in each city. If the husband is required to ride to and from work, at least 500 rides should be provided for; and provision should be made for the necessary use of a street care for the wife for shopping and marketing.

(6) *Amusement and Recreation.*—The importance of amusement and recreation need not be emphasized, and is accepted generally. The only question is the character and the cost of it; and here it is not easy to define standards. Wholesome amusement is derived within the circle of a family and it costs nothing; whereas on the other hand, the complexities of modern city life places a money price on many simple pleasures. Thus a picnic for the family or a visit to a park or a trip on the river, involves the cost of street carfare and the ferry. Occasional visits to the movie house are to be expected among some of the members of the family. And while this budget excluded the cost of summer vacations, some allowance must be made for some forms of recreation if the family is not to lead an isolated life. $20 a year has been set by the Bureau (1).

(7) *Newspapers.*—One daily newspaper and one Sunday edition is allowed. The cost varies according to the prevailing price for these in each centre.

(8) *Organizations.*—The church and labour unions play an important part in the life of the average worker and his family. Although no quantitative standard can be established, but $13 a year for the church and $10 for labour union dues have been roughly set.

(9) *Incidentals.*—In addition to the above items there are a large number of small or occasional items which cannot be avoided by a worker's family—such as stationery, postage, telephoning, telegraphing at times, tobacco, etc. No minimum quantities can be established for these, and a covering sum of $52 for the year is allowed.

It is essential to bear in mind, and the Bureau of Labour Statistics earnestly emphasizes, that this budget is not intended as an ideal budget (2). It is rather intended to establish a bottom level of health and decency below which a family cannot go without danger to physical and moral deterioration. The budget does not include many comforts which should properly be included in what is designated as an "American Standard of living"; thus no provision is directly made for savings other than insurance, nor for vacations, nor for books, and other

(1) Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget, opp. cit. p. .
(2) Tentative Quantity and Cost Budget. Monthly Labor Review, Dec. 1919, pp. 22–29.

educational purposes. But on the other hand, it is considered that a family which is supplied with the items listed in this budget should be able to maintain itself in health and modest comfort. It would have a sufficiency of food, respectable clothing, sanitary housing, and a minimum of the essential "sundries" (1).

COST OF LIVING INVESTIGATION IN CANADA

Not finding any official or reliable commodity budget constructed for Canada, the Brotherhood adopted for the use of their study the most popular commodity budget on this continent, namely, the one constructed by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in the United States, which has been discussed above. As has been shown, this budget gives with a great deal of detail the minimum quantity of goods and services necessary to maintain a family of five for a year at a level of "minimum health and decency." The budget is not only valuable in the fullness of items listed, but in that it enables accurate measurement of the cost of living *according to this standard* anywhere at any time. It is necessary only to get the prices, at the time and place desired, of the specified items, multiply each unit price by the quantity specified for the year, and add the sums obtained.

The Brotherhood gives careful reasons for their choice of this standard:

"(*a*) The Dominion Government has constructed no commodity budget.

(*b*) No provincial government, nor other agency in Canada, so far as the Brotherhood could discover, has constructed a commodity budget, with the single exception of the Martel Budget, which has some deficiencies comparable to the budget of the Labour Gazette.

(*c*) The items of goods and services and the quantity of each required, (which is all that a commodity budget sets forth) vary little as between many parts of the United States and Canada; and such variations as should be made in a United States budget to adapt it more accurately to Canadian use, (e.g. warmer clothing, and houses, more fuel, more heat-producing food) are principally variations which would increase rather than decrease the total cost of the budget in Canada.

(*d*) This budget is not a partisan production, but the result of official government work of great care and extent; all pertinent facts regarding the structure of the budget are matters of public record readily available; and the budget has high scientific standing after a number of years wide use.

(*f*) All studies of the cost of living in the United States were made by use of budgets closely conforming to, or actually approximating the standard of minimum health and decency already defined" (2).

---

(1) Ibid, opp. cit. pp. 26–8. Note: "It is estimated that a family favoured by circumstances, may be able to effect the following savings: totalling to $107.50 a year.

Food: (1) By purchasing each commodity at specially or lowest prices;
(2) By buying in bulk—such as canned vegetables by the dozen cans;
(3) By buying seasonal foodstuffs only when the prices are lowest.

If these methods are carried out to their extreme, food might be purchased at a saving possibly of 7½% on average market prices.

Clothing:
(1) By consistently following sales an appreciable saving might be effected in the course of a year.
(2) By consistently "making over" the outgrown or outworn garments of one member of the family for the use of another.

In this way a family might effect a total saving on the clothing bill of perhaps 10 per cent, without appreciably lowering the clothing standard set in the standard budget.

Housing: Since housing rents are not completely standardized, and rents vary for houses of identical character, with exceptional good fortune a family might be able to obtain a house at about a ten per cent lower rent, (although the equal chances are that they might have to pay 10 per cent higher than allowed in the budget.)

Sundries: The amounts of the sundries as allowed in this budget cannot be well cut by the average family without lowering its level of living below the standard of health and decency. A well situated family may however be able to effect certain savings on:
(a) car fare—if a family lives, or is able to obtain a home within walking distance of the husband's work, then this item can be entirely eliminated.

(2) Canadian Brotherhood of Railroad Employees, Ottawa, Can., 1922, Brief submitted in wage arbitration. (Typewritten.)

This budget was constructed so as to serve in laying down a standard of living suitable for wage earners in all parts of the country, irrespective of racial origin. The principal guide was that these workers and their families live and work in America, and if they have not already, are quickly assuming an American mode of living. This has been accepted as a proper guide and principal in our Canadian study and applied with the necessary local modifications.

Localities Chosen

The following centres were chosen by the Executive Committee of the Brotherhood for the study of the cost of living in Canada. These were chosen on the principle of one each, of a large, medium and small urban centre; as those in which railroad workers reside and work; as those which are principally railroad points on Canadian National lines, and on which Brotherhood members are employed. These cities are believed also to serve as guides for the cost of a minimum health and decency standard of living in each of the provinces in which these cities are located.

	Population 1921 Census
Maritime Provinces:	
Sydney, N. S.	22,545
Truro, N.S.	7,562
Moncton, N.B.	17,488
Central Provinces:	
Toronto, Ont.	521,893
Belleville, Ont.	12,206
Montreal, Que.	618,506
Coteau Jct., Que.	.....
Western Provinces:	
Winnipeg, Man.	179,087
Saskatoon, Sask.	25,739
Kamloops, B.C.	4,501

The investigation was conducted during the spring, summer and fall of 1925, lasting from March 9 to November 12. Prices were secured in the "personal shopping" method. The stores in seven of the above named cities were visited by the writer.(1) The findings and the method of precedure follow below:—

Average Cost of Minimum Health and Decency Budget in Canada

Summary of Family Budget for Worker's Family of Five Persons.

I.	Food		$ 639 04
II.	Clothing:		
	Husband	$118 70	
	Wife	147 60	
	Boy, 12 years	83 21	
	Girl, 6 years	65 14	
	Boy, 2 years	38 26	452 91
III.	Household Equipment	$979 93	
	7 per cent annual upkeep		68 59
IV.	Rent, Light and Heat		565 30
V.	Cleaning Supplies, etc.		44 10
VI.	Miscellaneous		432 43
	Total		$2,202 37

(1) Belleville, Ont., Montreal, Que., and Coteau Jct., Que., were investigated by the Labor Bureau Inc., of Boston, Mass. Toronto, Ont., was studied in collaboration with the Labor Bureau.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

On arriving at each city the following procedure was carried out:

1. A tour of the city to become acquainted with the character of each residential section; ascertaining the class of people resident in each, the types of housing, and local shop services. Establishing the workers' section.

2. Classifying the stores. Ascertaining which ones in the business or downtown section are patronized by working people; which sell reliable, medium-priced goods; which specialize in "fancy" or "job-lot" goods; ascertaining to what extent departmental or small stores have wage-earners' custom; ascertaining to what extent workers' wives shop in their local stores, and which of these carry full and medium-grade, medium-priced stock of wares; ascertain to what extent the cash-and-carry or credit system of buying prevails.

3. Classifying municipal services. Ascertaining what hospital, dispensary and other medical services exist, and to what extent these are available free, or partially free of charge, to working people, and to what extent these are used. Ascertaining what recreational facilities are available, playgrounds for children, parks, clubs, community houses, social and athletic associations.

4. Classifying amusement and educational facilities; theatres, libraries, churches, schools, lodges, museums, etc.

5. Ascertaining local methods of transport, lighting, heating and cooking fuel.

B. *Pricing the Budget.*—Having become acquainted with the sections of the city and the stores, the following were eliminated:

(1) *Stores*: Bargain-sale or "job-lot" stores; which did not appear to have a permanent character; stores which catered only to the very poorest people; stores which did not carry a reliable class of goods. The five-and-ten-cent stores; stores which sacrificed quality to maintain low prices; stores which did not have working class custom.

(2) *Houses:* Only those houses which stood in well-cared for, respectable working class districts and which contained all the conveniences which conformed to the building laws and requirements of sanitation, health and decency, were chosen. Houses in the slum districts or near factories or railway tracks were not included.

Five quotations from five separate stores were obtained for each item on the budget. No price was obtained over the telephone or by mail. The writer visited each store, personally examined the commodity to be priced. Prices were not taken from irresponsible salespeople. In the department stores, prices were secured from either, managers of departments, buyers, or from those clerks which were appointed by the manager to render this service. In the small stores prices were obtained from the proprietor direct. In all cases, with only two exceptions in one eastern city, this service was rendered with interested attention and helpful guidance.

The following order was observed in pricing the items:—

1. *Food*—Meats, fish, groceries, fruits and vegetables were priced in the separate stores specializing in these goods: meat at the butcher stores, fish at the fish store, etc. In the choice of grocery stores, it was found advantageous both from the point of view of economy in time and choice of goods, to select the grocery store which stocked both groceries and fruits and vegetables. On checking the prices, it was found that the prices did not vary here from the fruiterer's. Prices were also obtained from the vegetable truck-dealer. Care was had to establish and price the same grade, make, size, at all stores, and a great deal of difficulty was experienced in this task.

Food of a medium quality was selected. Quotations on medium-quantities, such as a family of five would purchase, were taken. Cash and not credit prices were asked for. Extra charges for delivery services were ascertained. "Sale" prices were not considered.

2. *Clothing.*—Prices were obtained from departmental stores, reliable ladies' wear stores, from men's clothing and haberdashers, from children's clothing, and boot and hat or millinery stores. Garments of a medium-grade, of reliable make, which promised durability and true economy, were selected. Only standard prices were taken; bargain-sales, or "special" priced goods were disregarded. In those stores which stocked exclusive wear, the more moderate grades were selected. As a rule, the principal guide to the practical quality were those garments designated usually as "best sellers"; the ordinary citizen's and practical working person's choice. Both the choice of stores and the selection of articles were checked up by interviewing workers and their wives, as well as other representative citizens of the city.

3. *Housing.*—Quotations on working class homes in working class districts were secured, together with the street and number of each house, from local reliable and established realtors. Having this, a personal visit to each house quoted on, was paid; each was in turn inspected, by the good will of the tenants residing there. In addition, an extensive independent inquiry, street by street, of selected representative houses, was made from the people living in them. From this inquiry and investigation was gained: (1) the rent of the house; (2) an inspection of the type of house; (3) the amount of fuel burned and the annual cost of same; (4) the amount and cost of lighting, and cooking fuel, as well as the type of cooking and heating appliances and methods; (5) water rates, and other taxes.

4. *Household Equipment.*—The budget allows only a very modest type of furniture and furnishings. This of course is not easy to select, for here as in clothing, the range of style, make, quality, and personal taste is wide. Therefore again the "best sellers", the goods purchased by the average citizen were relied upon. In this also great care had to be exercised. Many workers indulge in chesterfield suites, victrolas, in radios, in sunparlours. In the last years there have risen vogues in kinds of wood and workmanship. The choice for this budget was: (1)

(*a*) For the living room: oak, leather-covered armchairs, a davenport to match, with the purpose in mind that this can be used to supply an extra bed-room when necessary; an oak library table, and an inexpensive standard-size floor rug.

(*b*) For the dining room: a simple, medium-priced oak dining room suite of eight pieces; a set of six diners, an extension table, and a buffet. For the floor, a congoleum rug.

(*c*) For the kitchen: A coal range; a 48-inch pine table, two chairs, and a full range of kitchen utensils, of economical and lower priced grades (*i.e.*, grey enamel pots).

(*d*) For the bedrooms: Modern steel beds, oak furniture of simple but durable make; rag carpets; medium quality, durable and economical bed furnishings.

As explained in the details of the budget in chapter four, these items are presumed to have been purchased as the home was organized by the family. They constitute what has been agreed upon as being necessary equipment for a family of five persons, living in health and decency. The budget allows only for 7 per cent annual upkeep cost on such equipment.

(1) See Appendix No. 1 for detailed prices on each item in the equipment list. For a composite list see Chapter four, pp.

As will be noted, there are no provisions for such sundries as curtains, window shades, etc. These items are to be supplied somehow from the possible savings in the home economy.

Local Purchasing Conditions

With minor exceptions all of the commodities listed on the budget were found in stock in the stores and in demand by the custom. These exceptions were not in the realm of food, and clothing, but in household equipment—for instance, some western stores did not stock dish drainers, though they did have bridge tables.

Houses in urban centres do not vary to any great degree; and it was comparatively easy to secure the rent of a standard five or six-roomed house containing the standard conveniences.

The important variations were found in local methods of heating, the kind of fuel used, and in the kinds of cooking fuel locally available. Throughout electricity was the mode of lighting the home.

Further variations were made in the choice of underclothing and top clothing for the winter months; in the western cities those of heavier make were selected.

On the whole it was found that the items listed in the budget were those which are to-day the most standardized in manufacture and in distribution in all parts of the country. The large department stores, the mail-order houses, the jobbers, the travelling salesmen from the large central business houses, the staple manufactures, and national advertising have made the procurance of a standard budget such as this is, not an ideal, but a reality and actuality. It is not a question now whether these articles are being bought by working people and their families, but whether they are bought in sufficient quantities to allow them to live in health and decency. The fact that these articles are for sale everywhere in quantities, that they are considered as standard and ordinary stock, shows that these are purchased and are in demand. To repeat: the question is how many workers' families can and do buy these items in sufficient quantities and in the order of their necessity. That these commodities are now in the realm of "plain" frugal necessities, and not luxuries, was seen by the writer when she was told by the proprietor of an ambitious store serving a working class community: "We don't take much stock of these goods you are interested in; they are common—we don't make much money on them—they are too standardized." The same was experienced in the clothing and furniture stores.

Shopping centres, housing and social conditions, heating and cooking resources were found in the centres visited as follows:

Maritime Provinces

The three cities visited here were Sydney, N.S., Truro, N.S. and Moncton, N.B. In all, industries are centered and workers resident. The manufacturing done in them is not so much for local consumption as for export and outside trade. Sydney has established in it the steel works of the British Empire Steel Corporation, and fifteen miles (one hour on the street car) away, the collieries of the Dominion Coal Company, now the B.E.S. Co. Truro has the Borden Milk Co., the Stanfield Knitting mills, and the Eastern Cap Co. Moncton has the Record Foundry Co., the Atlantic Knitting Mills, and a biscuit factory. In all the railway workers form a major part of the working classes, and all these points are important railway points on the Canadian National line in the east.

The majority of the necessaries, and those things which are considered as luxuries of life, are largely imported from Montreal and Toronto, from Halifax, from the west. Fruit, vegetables, fish, meat, and dairy products are supplied from the surrounding farms. Annapolis Valley, the south of Nova Scotia is famed for its fruit industry. Clothing, furniture, and household sundries are imported into the cities.

Both provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, burn bituminous coal; New Brunswick has a supply of natural gas, and Nova Scotians do not use gas at all.

In each city the main shopping centre is the "main street." On these were found from two to four department stores, which served the large majority of the working classes. They stocked a fair variety of medium quality and conservative goods, including groceries, clothing, household furnishings, but not furniture.

Food was purchased in equal extent from the downtown stores as from the district stores. Distances here are not great and shopping is done either on foot or by street car. Cash-and-carry trade is not noticeably developed. All food stores extend credit; among railway workers this is the common method of purchasing since pay-day comes twice a month—on the first and the fifteenth. The majority of the grocery stores serving working class commodities and those on the main streets were found to be well-stocked, well-run and of reliable and permanent character.

Clothing is bought almost entirely downtown; an occasional hair-ribbon or pair of socks may be bought from the corner dry goods store. For ladies' garments, and children's wear, the department stores were found to be the most frequently patronized, while the ladies' wear stores also did a representative trade. Men bought their suits of clothes and haberdashery from favoured men's clothing stores, which were found to render reliable service and with little competition in prices. In every city of course were found the custom tailors who took pride in special workmanship and quality. The better paid railway workers secured their clothing here. Shoes and hats are bought from small stores specializing in these commodities, and to a degree also from the department stores. To one who comes from large so-called "style centres," like Toronto or Montreal, the type of clothing offered for sale seemed limited both in quality and in style.

In each city were found from one to three furniture stores. These sold both for cash and for credit. In each there are two classes of stores: one that caters to the so-called "better class" of customer, and stocks higher-priced wares, and the other that stocks medium grade and lower-priced goods. Workers frequented both. Since there was the limited number of this type of store, prices on furniture were obtained from all in order to have a sufficient range of quotations. It was found that the so-called better class or higher-priced store offered as much economy in price for oftentimes better grade furniture, than was experienced in the lower-priced stores, where as a rule the stock was incomplete, the choice limited, and the furniture not infrequently sorry looking. A great deal of furniture is bought from the T. Eaton Co. Ltd. mail order department in Moncton, N.B.

Household furnishings are purchased from the department stores and dry goods or linen stores. Kitchen utensils are purchased from the hardware stores which stock not only pots and tinware but also crockery and cutlery. From two to four hardware were found in each city.

Housing

The majority of the houses are of frame construction with an occasional brick structure, of the two-story type, and semi-detached. Quite a number of families live in small type apartment houses. In all the family houses selected for this budget, there are baths, running water toilets, furnaces, electricity (gas in New Brunswick), cellars, lawns and yards. The rooms are of standard size, with sufficient windows for air and light. They stand in what are known as respectable working class districts.

Here a word must be said as to what is meant by " respectable working class districts."

It is almost a truism that in every city there are several cities. Especially in the New World, into which have poured many immigrants, there have grown up in each section of the city immigrant communities, and forming what is known as an " immigrant bloc." We speak of such immigrant " blocs " in the western provinces. But there is yet another factor which helps form a " bloc," and that is an industry itself. Certain classes of people, sometimes taken perhaps from one race or nationality, work in a particularly large industry and form a community around that industry.

In Sydney, Nova Scotia, the largest industry and it may be said the only industry outside of the railway, are the steel works. The workers employed in it live around the works either in company houses or in rented ones. The company houses are of a one-type style; frame, two-story, brown-painted, box-like affairs. The rent is comparatively low, and they are let only to steel workers. There are not enough of these company houses to house all the steel workers;; there are only a few hundred of them while the employees number several thousand. Those of the workers who cannot rent company houses must rent others, and near the works. They must rent them near the works, for their wages are such as to prohibit them going further into the so-called better parts of the town. There are no great advantages living near the works, for the smoke, soot, noise, and general vista do not tend to make residence there comfortable or pleasant. Moreover, in the near vicinity of the steel works, one also comes close to both an unhealthy and unpleasant odour that is constantly issuing from the coke-ovens. Added to these circumstances are the facts that the majority of the steel workers are " foreigners ", people who have come to Canada from Ukrania, Russia, Poland, and other parts of southeastern Europe. During the war the steel company imported a great many Barbado negroes. All these people now form what is known in Sydney as the " Pier district ". The " Pier district " is a peninsular part of the city, cut off from the other sections not only by reason of its population composite, but also because of its living conditions and type of exterior. It is seated on the waterfront of Sydney harbour.

The " Pier district " in Sydney is the slum district. There live the foreigners of every type and nation; Russians, Poles, Ukranians, Jews, and negroes. The majority of them work in the steel works; the majority of the Jewish people keep stores. The house-rent is said to be cheap; judged by what is offered for the rent, this may well be questioned. The houses are of frame, but in a dilapidated condition; they look as if repairing were rarely done. Some have no indoor water supply. Most of them have no furnaces, nor backyards, nor front lawns. Though they are built two-story style, presumably for two families, the ceilings are low and the rooms small enough to allow conversion into one-story homes for one average family. The family in the " Pier District " is not the standard " five person " type, but many times larger. There are also, perhaps for the sake of saving space, tenement houses, from three to five stories

high. These are straight, box-like in style, of the prevailing frame construction. In the three to five room flats are housed large families; sometimes with and other without baths or separate water-taps or sinks. As a result of the dilapidated housing conditions, the carie odours emanating from the coke-oven plants, the unavoidably low standard of living among these people, this is now also known as the crime district—stabbings, shootings, robberies have been reported.

Another district which has fallen into disrepair and disfavour is that around the railway tracks. Houses which may once have been of fine construction have been allowed to fall apart almost, and the quite understandable inconvenience of living within too near earshot of the railway engine and soot and smoke, has driven here also a class of people whose living standards and conditions are low.

There are left then those sections of the city in which better-paid workers live, on streets which are not filled with objectionable odours or noises, where there are lawns, grass and trees. In houses which are in reputable repair, in which there are the requirements of sanitation and modern comfort and services; in rooms which are of sufficient size and number to allow the civilized "decencies" and where the general standard of living is not peaked and pinched.

These divisions of the city were found existing in all the centres visited; the degree and extent of the slum districts ranging with the type and the development of both industrial and municipal development.

Municipal Services

In all these cities there are public hospitals; but in all the cost of their services may be deemed as in some cases, prohibitive to workingmen's families. In none are there any public clinic services, with the exception of the medical inspection of public school children in the public schools. But this service also, in comparison with that developed in older provinces, like Ontario, is only slightly developed. There is no organized city-wide public health nursing service, with the exception of the services rendered in this regard by the Red Cross Society.

The children's playgrounds are being installed. The Y.W.M.C.A. offers athletic and recreation club facilities in each centre. The churches supplement in their own way.

In every city was found a small public library, public and high schools, business schools, moving picture theatres, lodges and other forms of community organization.

Central Provinces

The cities surveyed here were: Toronto, Ont., Belleville, Ont., Montreal, Que., Coteau Jct., Que. Being situated in the main and most important industrial provinces, these are the most typical working class centres, as well as that of wealth. The industries located here are too numerous to quote; but sufficient it is to say that of most of the products consumed by Canadians and exported outside, are manufactured and distributed from here. These are then not only important industrial but also railway centres.

The majority of the necessaries of life as listed on the budget are produced not only within each province, but also within each city, with the exception of dairy products, fruit and vegetables, which are delivered into the city from surrounding farms and gardens. Being the large cities of the Dominion, a considerable amount of clothing, furniture, food and by-products are imported from outside.

Shopping Centres

The main or downtown streets form the hub of the shopping district. It is not easy to gauge how much of every day foods are bought from the local store or from the department "groceterias," or from the district cash-and-carry stores. The service of the telephone, the highly developed delivery services make this method of purchasing convenient and advantageous.

For pricing food the cities were therefore divided off into representative working class sections. Prices were then collected from the stores in these localities; then from the chain, cash-and-carry stores, and from the departmental grocery departments. In this way a representative range of prices were secured.

For clothing it was ascertained that the downtown shops were the most frequentd by working class shoppers. The department stores ranged in importance, followed by men's clothing, ladies' wear, shoe and millinery stores. For men's clothing the custom tailors were also consulted.

For furniture and furnishings for the house, the department stores, the representative and reliable downtown furniture stores, dry goods stores, and hardware stores were interviewed. The furniture, hardware and dry goods stores which were known to be reliable and permanent in character and which carried a good stock of wares, situated in the working class sections in all parts of the city were included. In all of these only cash prices were taken, and care was had to obtain quotations on an identical article in each store. Standardized products helped to make this method possible.

Housing.

Houses in this part of the country are built of brick, in the two-story style, and either detached, semi-detached or in terrace-like rows. Those selected for this budget had the standard sanitary requirements, furnaces, gas, electricity, verandahs, backyards, and lawns. In Montreal many families were known to reside in apartment houses; in Toronto to a less extent; while in smaller centres like Belleville, Ont., and Coteau Jct., Que., the small family house prevailed. The choice of apartment for the families living in the former cities included heat, good plumbing, lighting and cooking facilities, and the requisite number of rooms for the family under consideration.

In these large industrial centres, what has above been described as a slum prevails to the same degree and type, but over a larger area and over several areas in the city. These areas were excluded from the price-survey.

Municipal Services

Municipal services to citizens are further developed in these provinces than in the Maritimes. Hospital clinics, medical inspection of school children in the schools, public health nursing service, scavenger service, playgrounds, parks, boys' and girls' clubs, lodges, libraries branching over all parts of the city, theatres, "movies," zoological gardens, skating rinks, public schools, ranging from the lowest to the highest, etc., are available, comparatively free of charge. As to whether these services are sufficient in extent and how satisfactory are the services offered or rendered, and to what number of people in the proportion of the city's population and taxable wealth, may form the theme of a separate discussion.

Western Provinces

Winnipeg, Man., Saskatoon, Sask., and Kamloops, B.C., were investigated. These provinces form Canada's prairie and western coast centres; the wheat, lumber, mining, cattle, and fishing industries predominate. In the cities, however, where the workers congregate, around the industries they serve, the indis-

tinguishable type of urban life as found in all other urban centres, is present. Stores, offices, factories, wide, brightly lit business streets, theatres, business and varying residential sections.

Imports supply the majority of the people's requirements. Clothing and furniture especially are brought in from the east—Montreal and Toronto.

Shopping Centres

In this part of the country the writer came upon a quickly developing large city, like Winnipeg, and two smaller centres comparable to the ones visited in the eastern (Maritime) provinces.

In Winnipeg it was found like in Toronto and Montreal, that the bulk of shopping was done downtown, and notably in the T. Eaton Co., Ltd., large department store. Here everything for the family was procurable and purchased. The leading service which was most noticeably taken advantage of, is the finely developed cash-and-carry "groceteria"; in addition to the large range of choice, and the attractive prices, there is a delivery service if the individual's purchase amounted to or exceeded a certain sum of money. Here again, the ease offered by the telephone and the service of this highly developed establishment, made this particular store the centre of shopping for the majority of the working class families. Other stores, departmental and individual however are also established, and patronized by this varied population.

Winnipeg is sharply divided in its working class and foreign population sections. The city stretches out into outlying suburbs and street cars must be resorted to to get into the downtown districts. For pricing the budget therefore, these divisions and distances were taken into account, and it was found that many people gave a notable amount of their business to local stores, and the proper representative stores were therefore consulted.

Food, as mentioned above, is bought to a large extent in the T. Eaton Co. groceteria. But serving each working class district, are established several kinds of chain-stores, both for meat and groceries. In addition there are well-stocked and established individual food stores. In the chain-store cash prevails, and in the district individual store, credit is extended. Both of these were noted.

Clothing is purchased largely downtown where the variety of stores and goods offer both choice in garments and price. For the items on the budget prices were obtained from those stores which are known to be largely patronized by the average worker and his family and which offer reliable goods and services; these consisted of the several department stores, a choice of men's clothing, women's wear, shoe and millinery stores.

Furniture and house furnishings were priced in department stores, in the reliable and most favoured furniture stores, in the fully stocked hardware stores. Cash prices only were obtained.

For all items care was taken that quotations were secured on the same grade, size, make and quantity at all stores visited.

Housing

The frame structure of house prevails in Winnipeg. In working class districts selected, these are of two-story family type, in good repair, furnished with complete plumbing supplies, furnace, verandah, the size of rooms necessary to the health of the family, gas and electricity.

The prevailing method of heating the homes is anthracite coal, though of late a move has been made to use bituminous coal. Gas and electricity are used for cooking, and electricity predominantly for lighting.

Municipal Services

As in the larger eastern cities, municipal services in the form of hospitals, clinics, medical inspection of school children, public-health nursing service, play-

grounds, parks, library branches over the city, recreation clubs, a zoo, etc., are developed in a form and to a degree that merit praise.

In the smaller cities, namely, Saskatoon and Kamloops, the conditions vary somewhat and may be given separate mention:

Saskatoon

The city is divided into three sections: the downtown, which consists of the main shopping streets, and back of these, to the north, the higher-priced residential parts, adjacent to the city park. Here also are the social clubs and lodges and meeting places. On the hill to the northwest, stands the University of Saskatchewan, and surrounding are again a part of the better-class residents, and further away westward, the "better class" workers' homes, which to a great number are the ones belonging to higher-paid railway workers. The western section of the city is taboo; here are grouped the "lower class" workers, the labourers, the foreigners. This district is so decidedly marked off, that there is developed a lively separate shopping district for these residents.

The main shopping centre is on and around two main streets—Second and Third Avenue. All kinds of stores, from the Hudson Bay department store, to the range of butcher, grocery, fruit, clothing, furniture and hardware stores are here located. But the two popular stores for the workers and the average, not the "stylish" shoppers are the T. Eaton Co. groceteria and the Macmillan company department store. But judging from the hum of business and the look of prosperity of the other stores, it is evident and correctly assumed that all stores were catering to the 2,500 largely working class population.

Food, it was found is being purchased in equal proportion from the T. Eaton Company groceteria, from the one chain-store system, and from selected individual shops. The department stores (three in number) were not patronized for food as for wearing apparel. Quotations on the items in the budget were therefore secured from the most representative and reliable sources.

Clothing is purchased largely from the department stores, with emphasized preference for the store mentioned above, which carries a range of satisfying and practical quality goods. There is quite a range of men's clothing stores and a chosen number and types of these were also consulted, as well as reliable women's wear and shoe and hat stores.

Furniture and furnishings are supplied in the main by the department stores, by two other individual stores who extend credit, and from the T Eaton Co. mail order service. Kitchen ware is supplied by the individual hardware stores and department stores. All these were consulted and cash prices obtained on the articles established to serve in the investigation.

Housing

As throughout the western provinces, the frame structure of house prevails here. As in all other centres the slum districts were excluded and the satisfying representative working class districts were selected, in which quotations were secured on houses which contained the requisites for health and comfort, as already described. Some difficulty was experienced in making this selection, for Saskatoon has experienced a building book, during which period a great many large houses were careless and quickly "thrown up" and these stand to-day less and less able to answer the needs of a small working class family and the desired health standard.

Bituminous coal is burned in the province, and gas is not available. Kerosene in kerosene stoves are used for cooking, or woodstoves. Electricity is used for lighting.

Municipal Services

Some public medical services are here rendered by the Red Cross Society who have established a Public Health Centre. This however is with the intent to serve the very poor and in the form of charity, rather than being a municipal service. On the whole, outside of the public schools, park, library, there are few other municipal services developed.

Kamloops

Kamloops, next to Coteau Junction in Quebec, was the smallest industrial center visited. Its population in 1921 numbered 4,500 and its residents are grouped around in a few streets surrounding and branching out of, to all sides. from the main street. Here are ranged all the shops: butcher, grocery, clothing, and furniture-and-hardware.

Groceries are purchased from a favoured grocer, perhaps not so much for the difference in price, for there is not that, but because of some social or community reason. Interesting it is that in so small a town there are about eight well-established, completely equipped and stocked grocery stores, in most of them from one to three clerks assisting in white jackets, and with delivery wagon service. Most of the business is done on a credit basis; though there is one merchant that specializes in cash-and-carry. Most of the custom comes from railway workers, for Kamloops is a busy junction on the C.N.R. line, overnight from Vancouver. Meat is bought from the P. Burns Company well-stocked store, whose prices compete vigorously and powerfully with the three smaller butchers.

There is a Hudson Bay department store in the town, but this is quite noticeably ignored by the townspeople, who rather go to the individual stores for their styles and supplies. There are a number each of men's clothing, women's wear, dry goods, and hardware stores. One of the latter carries the only full stock of furniture and household furniture, but purchasers do not suffer from this monopoly, for the T. Eaton Co. mail order departments in Vancouver and Alberta fill many Kamloops orders, and the prices of the local merchant compare favourably.

Prices on the items in the budget therefore were obtained from this range of representative stores and added inquiries were made as to the type of furniture supplied to the inhabitants by the T. Eaton Co., and prices on these were also secured.

Housing

One section in this town is considered by the Canadian workers as not desirable to reside in. This is the Italian street in which are also mixed some transient lumberjacks.

Prices were secured on the houses inhabited by the Canadian workers, which prevailing type is a frame structure, with the requisite plumbing, with electricity, but seldom with a furnace; even the new houses recently put up have no furnaces. There is no gas available and kerosene is used for cooking in stoves made for that type of fuel. Bituminous coal is used for heating, in coal or combination coal-and-wood stoves. The winter is reported as being not severe and of no great duration.

Municipal Services

The town is small, the organization simple; and no services have been developed by the municipality along the lines noted for the larger centres.

MINIMUM HEALTH AND DECENCY BUDGET FOR A WORKINGMAN'S FAMILY OF FIVE PERSONS, CONSISTING OF HUSBAND, WIFE, BOY 12 YEARS, GIRL 6 YEARS, AND BOY 2 YEARS

Food

The food budget is calculated for a family of five persons, consisting of husband, wife, and three minor children, dependent on the earnings of the father.

Food experts have estimated that a man who is at moderately hard muscular work must have from 3,000 to 3,200 calories per day. Since about 10 per cent of the calorie value of food is calculated to be wasted in cooking in preparation of the food, etc., it is necessary to purchase 3,500 calories per man per day in food, so that 3,200 calories can be consumed and assimilated. The proportion of food necessary for the husband, wife, and children have been determined by laboratory experiments and estimates made according to age, sex, weight, occupation and activity. Upon this scientific basis this food has been constructed. The combined food requirements of this family is calculated as equal to that of 3.35 adult males.

Below is a list of the kinds and annual quantity of food necessary to provide sufficient nourishing food, with sufficient variety to allow for a proper balance of diet.

ANNUAL QUANTITY OF FOOD FOR A FAMILY OF FIVE, CONSISTING OF FATHER, MOTHER, AND THREE MINOR CHILDREN

Item	Pounds	Item	Pounds
Meat—		Fats: Mixed Fats, Vegetable Oil, etc.—	
Beef, fresh, steak	75	Lard	37
roast	63	Crisco	7
stew	47	Lard compound	13
Beef, salt, corned	10	Oleo	13
dried	1	Mazola, cottonseed oil, etc	11
Veal, fresh, cutlet, roast, stew	13	Eggs	102
Pork, fresh, chops, roast	30	Cereals and their Products—	
salt, bacon	19	Flour, wheat	332
ham and shoulder	18	rye	12
side, dry	7	graham	46
pickled	2	Corn meal	25
Mutton, chops, roast, stew	28	Hominy or grits	12
Poultry, hens	23	Cream of wheat	7
Sausage	16	Corn flakes	4
Liver	10	Rolled oats	58
Cooked, meat, ham	8	Bread, wheat	457
Bologna, corned beef	10	rye	22
Fish—		graham	2
Fresh	41	Rolls	22
Salt	5	Crackers	18
Canned salmon	10	Cake	15
Canned tuna	2	Pies	4
Oysters	5	Macaroni, Spaghetti, Noodles	33
Other sea food	6	Rice	44
Dairy Products—		Sugars—	
Milk, whole	1,602	Sugar	163
condensed, evaporated	65	Corn syrup, Molasses, Honey	36
Cream	3	Candy	10
Ice cream	8	Fresh Fruits—	
Butter	80	Apples	219
Cheese, Canadian	14	Peaches	28
cottage	6	Bananas	54
		Lemons	10

ANNUAL QUANTITY OF FOOD FOR A FAMILY OF FIVE, CONSISTING OF FATHER, MOTHER, AND THREE MINOR CHILDREN—*Continued*

Item	Pounds	Item	Pounds
Fresh Fruits—*Con.*		Carrots	52
Oranges	100	Turnips	40
Grapes	14	Cauliflower	
Berries	51	Parsnips	
Cantaloupe	10	Peppers	27
Watermelon	15	Asparagus	
Other fruit	36	Cucumbers	
Grapefruit	22	Radishes	
Dried Fruits—		Dried Vegetables	
Prunes	24	Beans, navy	24
Raisins, currants	11	Peas	5
		Beans, lima	15
Canned Fruits—			
Peaches	23	Canned Vegetables—	
Pineapple	2	Beans, baked	5
Berries	22	Peas	10
Jelly	10	Corn	19
Fruit butter		Tomatoes, soup	30
Fresh Vegetables—		Miscellaneous—	
Potatoes, white	738	Cocoa	5
sweet	48	Peanut butter	5
Cabbage	82	Chocolate	1
Spinach, kale, etc	78	Cornstarch	4
Beans, string	37	Tapioca	2
Tomatoes	130	Tea	10
Onions	74	Coffee	40
Corn	36	Gelatine	1
Lettuce	10	Ice	2,800
Celery	7	(25 lbs. daily, for four months, approximately, from June to September, inclusive).	
Beets	24		

Clothing

The clothing chosen and listed is for the purpose of providing the physical needs of warmth, cleanliness and comfort, and also has regard for appearance and the prevailing style, so that all members of the family may appear in public and among friends with neatness and self-respect. There are of course wide divergencies in style and taste and quality. In this budget, however, since only the minimum of comfort is allowed, only those quantities of clothing and style are given which provide the minimum requirements of health and decency. In some respects the budget is even too economical, and leaves out many desirable articles. Like the food budget, the clothing is practical and not theoretical; it is made up of such articles as workingmen and their families wear and use. The quality chosen is that of practical economy and not luxury or "the last word in style."

The quantities listed below are for annual replacements, and not the number of garments possessed at any one time. For example, in the husband's clothing budget the annual requirements of a summer suit is given as one-third, which means that one summer suit is expected to last three years, etc. A considerable amount of sewing is to be done at home, and so indicated. There is no allowance for definite miscellaneous articles for each member of the family, but a lump sum of money is added to the total of each member's clothing allowance, as is shown below.

Since this is distinctly a minimum of health and decency budget, there is very little provision for "fashionable" dress. No silk dress, silk petticoats, or silk stockings are allowed for the wife: a wool dress, a sateen petticoat, cotton or lisle stockings only are allowed.

ANNUAL QUANTITY OF CLOTHING FOR A FAMILY OF FIVE, CONSISTING OF HUSBAND, WIFE, AND THREE CHILDREN, (BOY, 12; GIRL, 6. BOY, 2)

Article	Replacement per year
Clothing—Husband	
Summer Clothing—	
Hats, straw	1
Union suits	3
Suit of clothes	½
Winter Clothing—	
Hats, felt	½
Overcoats	¼
Sweaters	½
Union suits	2
Suits of clothes	½
Gloves, lea. street	1
Year-Round Clothing—	
Caps	1
Work trousers or overalls	2
Overalls	2
Shirts: dress	1
work	5
Nightshirts	2
Socks, cotton	12
Shoes: Dress	½
Work	2
Shoe Repairing—	
Whole soles	1
Half soles and heels	1
Rubbers	½
Gloves, cotton, work	6
Collars	6
Ties	2
Handkerchiefs, cotton	8
Garters	2
Belts	½
Suspenders	1
Umbrellas	½
Cleaning and pressing suit	1
Miscellaneous: A lump sum of money equal to about 7 per cent of total cost of clothing.	
Clothing—Wife	
Summer Clothing—	
Hats	1
Skirts, cotton	½
Waists, cotton, to be made at home	3
Waist, dress	½
Dresses, thin, cotton, to be made at home	2
Union suits	2
Petticoat, muslin	1
Shoes, low	1
Gloves, cotton	1
Winter Clothing—	
Hats	½
Suits, wool	½
Dress, wool	½
Coat, wool	⅓
Petticoats, sateen	1
Union suits	1
Shoes, high	1
Gloves (not kid)	1
Year-Round Clothing—	
House dresses	2
Aprons, kitchen (to be made at home)	1
Corsets	2
Combinations	2
Brassiers	2
Nightgowns, muslin	2
Kimonas	½
Stockings, cotton	8
Shoe repairing—	
New heels	3
Half soles and heels	1
Handkerchiefs, cotton	8
Umbrellas	½
Rubbers	1
Cleaning and pressing	1
Miscellaneous: a lump sum of money equivalent to about 8·5 per cent of total cost of clothing.	
Clothing—Boy, 12 years of age	
Summer Clothing—	
Trousers, separate, cotton	2
Overalls	1
Union suits	3
Shoes, low	2
Winter Clothing—	
Trousers, wool, separate	1
Overcoat or mackinaw	½
Sweaters	½
Union suits	2
Shoes, high	3
Gloves, knit	2
Year-Round Clothing—	
Caps	2
Suits, wool	1
Shirts, cotton	5
Pajamas or nightshirts	2
Stockings, cotton	12
Shoe repairing (½ soles and heels)	5
Rubbers	1
Ties	2
Handkerchiefs, cotton	6
Garters (to be made at home)	2
Belts	½
Miscellaneous: a lump sum of money equal to about 3 per cent of total cost of boy's clothing.	
Clothing—Girl, 6 years of age	
Summer Clothing—	
Hats	1
Dresses, cotton (to be made at home)	6
Petticoats, muslin	2
Shirts	3
Drawers, muslin	5
Nightgowns, muslin	1
Shoes, low	2
Winter Clothing—	
Caps or hats	½
Dresses, wool (to be made at home)	½
Coats, wool	½
Sweaters	½
Petticoats, outing, flannel	1
Shirts	2
Drawers, knit	2
Nightgowns, outing, flannel	1
Shoes, high	3
Gloves, knit	1
Year-Round Clothing—	
Aprons (to be made at home)	1
Underwaists	4
Stockings, cotton	12
Rubbers	1
Handkerchiefs (cotton)	6
Garters	2
Miscellaneous: a lump sum of money equal to about 8·5 per cent of girl's clothing.	

ANNUAL QUANTITY OF CLOTHING FOR A FAMILY OF FIVE, CONSISTING OF HUSBAND, WIFE, AND THREE CHILDREN, (BOY, 12; GIRL, 6; BOY, 2)—*Continued*

Article	Replacement per year	Article	Replacement per year
CLOTHING—BOY, 2 years of age		Winter Clothing—*Con.*	
		Nightgowns, outing, flannel	1
Summer Clothing—		Shoes, high	2
Hats, duck	1	Mittens, knit	1
Undershirts	3		
Drawers	3	Year-Round Clothing—	
Nightgowns, muslin	1	Dresses, cotton suits, rompers, overalls, etc. (to be made at home)	8
Shoes, low (sandals)	2	Underwaists	4
		Stockings and socks (cotton)	10
Winter Clothing—		Garters	2
Caps	1	Miscellaneous: a lump sum of money equal to about 6 per cent of 2 year old boy's total clothing.	
Overcoats	½		
Sweaters	½		
Undershirts	2		
Drawers	2		

HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

To turn a house into a home, it is necessary to have the equipment which will serve the members of the family with that amount of comfort and convenience, as will allow all of them to enjoy cleanliness, brightness and pleasantness of surroundings. Present day conventions and inventions, demand that certain kinds of furniture should be placed in the various rooms of a home, and that the housewife be provided with utensils, etc., necessary for housekeeping. The following list has been chosen to provide the equipment of a house of five rooms; living room, dining room, kitchen and two bedrooms, which is ordinarily found to be occupied by the standard family of five persons, for whom this budget has been constructed.

The articles and quantity given below is the kind of equipment designed as necessary, and generally assumed to be present in a workingman's home. The final budget cost here provides only for the annual upkeep of such equipment, and not for annual purchase.

NECESSARY HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

FURNITURE

Article	Number	Description
Refrigerator	1	Smallest size, sufficient for economy, in preserving food and in purchase of ice.
Tables—		
Dining room	1	Oak extension, plain, durable quality.
Living room	1	Oak, plain durable quality.
Kitchen	1	48-inch pine table, with 1 drawer.
Chairs—		
Dining room	6	Plain, durable, oak.
Living room	4	Oak or other durable wood.
Bedrooms	4	Strongly made.
Kitchen	1	Painted wood.
High chair	1	
Rugs—		
Living room	2	Small Axminster.
Dining room	1	Large crex, or rathina.
Bedrooms	4	Rag or crex, 3x6 feet.
Gocart	1	Folding, with metal framework and cloth top.
Sewing machine	1	Standard make.
Settee or davenport	1	Oak or other durable wood, imitation leather.
Sideboard	1	Medium size, oak.
Bureaus	2	Plain.
Chiffonier	1	Plain.
Beds, Mattresses and Springs—		
Double bed	1	Plain bedstead to match bureau; durable felt mattress, and spring.
Single beds	2	Each; plain bedstead; durable felt mattress and spring.
Crib, mattress and spring	1	White enamelled.

NECESSARY HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

Furnishings

Article	Number	Description
Towels—		
Kitchen hand towels	3	Cotton.
Bath towels	10	Turkish.
Hand towels	12	Part linen.
Tablecloths	3	Cotton, to be hemmed at home.
Table cover	1	For use when table is not set.
Napkins	18	Part linen, 22-inch.
Blankets—		
Double-bed size	1	Part wool.
Single-bed size	2	
Crib size	1	
Comforts—		
Double-bed size	1	Cotton, silkaline covered.
Single-bed size	2	
Crib size	1	
Spreads—		
Double-bed size	2	Good grade of rippelette, medium weight; number sufficient to provide for laundering.
Single-bed size	3	
Pillows—		
Ordinary size	4	Mixed feathers.
Crib size	1	
Sheets—		
Double-bed size	4	Number sufficient to provide for laundering.
Single-bed size	6	
Crib size	4	
Pillow Cases—		
Ordinary size	8	Number sufficient to provide for laundering.
Crib size	3	
Dish towels	8	Cotton, to be hemmed at home.
Table oilcloth	1	For pine table.

Utensils

Laundry tubs	2	Medium size, galvanized.
Washboard	1	Zinc.
Wringer	1	Medium size.
Boiler	1	Medium size, with copper bottom.
Flat irons	3	4, 5, and 6 lb. irons.
(Or electric iron of same weight.)		
Mops	2	1 handle for scrub mop, and 1 16-ounce dry mop.
Brooms	2	Good quality broom.
Dishes—		
50-piece set	1	Plain.
Water pitcher	1	Plain, heavy glass.
Vinegar cruet	1	" "
Oil cruet	1	" "
Salt shaker	1	" "
Pepper shaker	1	" "
Tumblers	6	Plain.
Knives, Forks, etc.—		
Butter knife	1	Quadruple plated, plain.
Sugar spoon	1	
Knives	6	
Forks	6	
Teaspoons	12	
Tablespoons	6	
Carving set	1	Good quality steel knife, and fork and sharpener.
Kitchen Utensils—		
Refrigerator pan	1	Galvanized.
Ice pick	1	Small, with wooden handle.
Garbage pail	1	Galvanized, medium size.
Dish rack	1	Wooden, with three rods.
Soap dish	1	Wire.
Dish pan	1	Enamel.
Dish drainer	1	Heavy wire, with plate holders.
Teakettle	1	Enamelled.
Coffee pot	1	Grey enamel.
Tea pot	1	" "
Preserving kettle	1	" "

NECESSARY HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

UTENSILS—*Con.*

Article	Number	Description
Kitchen Utensils—*Con.*		
Jelly glasses	36	With covers.
Fruit jars	36	Jars holding 1 qt.
Stew pans or kettles	2	Enamelled.
Cake pans	2	Heavy, pressed tin.
Pie pans	2	Pressed tin.
Bowls	2	Earthenware.
Large bread tins	2	Pressed tin.
Bread raising pan	1	Heavy tin, with cover.
Roasting pan	1	Medium size.
Bread box	1	
Frying pans	2	1 small pan, 1 med. sized iron.
Double boiler	1	Enamel, holding 1 qt.
Muffin pan	1	Tin; for 1 doz. muffins.
Colander	1	Grey enamel.
Chopping bowl and knife	1	Medium sized bowl, single knife.
Potato masher	1	Wire, with wooden handle.
Egg beater	1	Medium size and weight.
Meat grinder	1	Medium.
Grater	1	Tin.
Strainer	1	
Bread board	1	18 x 24 inches.
Large salt shaker	1	Tin.
Biscuit cutter	1	Tin.
Rolling pin	1	Wooden.
Flour sieve	1	Medium size.
Measuring cup	1	Tin or aluminum.
Lemon squeezer	1	Glass.
Can opener	1	
Large knife	1	
Case knives and forks	2	
Paring knife	1	
Wooden spoon	1	
Mixing spoons	3	
Pancake turner	1	

HOUSING

A house which is to afford the family the requirements of health, must consider primarily air space, ventilation, lighting, sanitation, privacy and proper separation of the sexes. There must be a sufficient number of rooms for the family, all sanitary conveniences now standardized by building and other codes, floor space, window space, location, and grounds. Such can be found in locations other than those quarters designated as "slums", and in the latter no human family should be forced to live.

For the average family of five persons, a house of five rooms, consisting of living room, dining room, kitchen and two bedrooms, should be provided as a minimum for health and decency. If the family be forced to live in less room space than that, there is danger of overcrowding and the consequent danger to health and physical efficiency. The rooms must be of standard size to allow proper light and ventilation, with at least one window in every room opening directly to the outer air. Each room is to have the possibility of cross ventilation either through windows, doors, or transoms. There should be a complete bathroom, with good plumbing, and proper drainage as will render impossible stagnant pools on the premises or the collection of water in the cellar or underneath the house. The building of course should be constructed according to the housing laws, local building codes, etc. The roof must be water-tight and the walls substantially constructed to meet the climatic conditions of the locality.

Every home must have proper heating. While the method of heating and the kind of fuel used, may vary, the temperature necessary to maintain the family in health and comfort remains constant; the temperature in the principal living room should be at least 68° F. in the coldest weather, in any locality. As for lighting, various systems may be used, but there should be sufficient to provide comfort.

Miscellaneous

In every family there are items of expenditure which cannot at all times be set down in absolute quantities. Sometimes these items cost as much as and more than the so-called principal necessities. These articles in fact are just what makes the difference between a decent and a hand-to-mouth existence. The family which is down-and-out must perforce try to manage on bare necessities such as food and some clothing, etc. But the worker who spends his years in trying to attain a civilized standard of living, finds that these items are just as, if not in many cases even more important than physical necessities. For who will gainsay that Life Insurance, and Medical care, is of less importance than food is? What worker or citizen can say that saving for old age, for unemployment, or other emergencies is less important than sufficient and warm clothing? Below is a list of some of these miscellaneous items selected as absolutely necessary in the family budget, if the family is to keep itself on a level of human decency. It will be noticed that savings are not allowed for; that is because this budget claims to give only the "minimum"; and the life insurance is the only form of savings so far allowed.

Miscellaneous Items

1. Cleaning Supplies and Services:	Annual Quantity.
(*a*) Personal:	
Small bar toilet soap	90
Toothbrush	5
Combs, hard rubber	1
Tooth paste (tube or box)	12
Hairbrush	½
Shoe polish, box	6
Barber's services: husband	12
Children	8
(*b*) Household:	
Laundry soap, ½ pound bar	150
Starch, pound	6
Cleanser, box	36

Small lump sum for unspecified cleaning supplies, such as borax, ammonia, washing powder, insect powder, bluing, etc., etc.

2. Laundry work and housework assistance for the wife, amounting to one day per week ($104 per year). From the standpoint of health, this is necessary for the mother of three children, who must do the cooking for the entire family, the general cleaning of the house, the sewing and mending, the marketing and shopping, and spend also sometime with her children.

3. Maintenance of health ($70 per year):

This item includes expenditure for physician, dentist, oculist, glasses, drugs, (including prescriptions and prepared remedies), and it is also to cover such medical needs as occasioned by child-birth, major operations, etc.

4. Insurance: Life, a $5,000 policy, with a premium of $110 per year. Furniture: a $1,000 policy, with a premium of $1.50 per year.

5. Carfare: The amount to be spent every year depends on the kind of transport locally available. But at least 600 rides are allowed for the husband, and a number for the wife to and from markets, etc.

6. Amusement and Recreation. $20 per year is allowed. This allows for such simple amusements as outings, picnics, boat rides, movie shows, and so on. There is no allowance for an annual holiday, though this is highly desirable.

7. Newspapers.—No general amount is set down, since the price for newspapers vary in different localities. But one newspaper daily and one Sunday edition is allowed for, if the worker and his family is to keep in touch with events, current and foreign.

8. Organizations, Labour Union, $10 per year; Church, $13 per year is allowed as the minimum necessary expenditure for the worker to keep in touch with movements.

9. Incidentals: $52 per year is allowed for such items as stationery, postage, telephoning, telegraphing, tobacco, and so on. None of these, and other such items are avoidable in the normal family life.

ANNUAL FULL TIME EARNINGS IN TERMS OF AVERAGE WAGES IN THIRTEEN CITIES IN CANADA, FOR THE YEAR 1925, NOT DEDUCTING TIME LOST THROUGH UNEMPLOYMENT OR OTHER CAUSES

Building Trades—		Electric Current Production and Transmission	1,497
Bricklayers	$2,311	Telephone Employees	1,332
Carpenters	1,731	Laundry Workers	788
Electricians	1,634	Sawmills	1,548
Painters	1,545	Bushmen	384 plus board
Plasterers	1,993		
Plumbers	1,889	Mines—	
Stonecutters	1,632	Coal	1,354
Labourers	1,076	Metal	1,330
Metal Trades—		Factory—	
Blacksmiths, Machinists, etc	1,937	Skilled	1,610
Printers	2,053	Semi-skilled	1,241
Civic Employees—		Farm—Season 1924—	
Policemen	1,485	Male, board and lodging	636
Firemen	1,386	Female, board and lodging	461
Labourers	955		
Longshoremen	1,580		

AVERAGE WORKING TIME AND WAGES PER YEAR OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND OF ALL CLASSES, INCLUDING GENERAL OFFICERS, ETC.

—	Average Hours Worked per Year*	Average Earnings per Hour	Average Earnings per Year
Telegraphers, etc	2,530	$0·689	$1,743
Road Freight conductors	2,925	0·864	2,527
Road Freight brakemen	2,746	0·672	1,845
Road Passenger engineers, etc	2,434	1·335	3,249
Road Passenger firemen	2,386	1·003	2,393
Road Passenger conductors	2,599	1·049	2,726
Clerks	2,424	0·570	1,382
Machinists	2,040	0·736	1,501
Sectionmen	2,469	0·365	901
All Classes	2,446	0·577	1,411

*Ascertained by dividing total hours worked by number of men employed.

Coal Miners—	
Days worked	250
Earnings	$557

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, May 25th, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 2 p.m., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask Mr. Hewitson to come forward.

ALBERT HEWITSON called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is your position in Cornwall?—A. I am overseer of the finishing and napping department in the Canadian Cottons.

Q. You are largely interested in what end of the business in Cornwall?—A. The manufacturing business.

Q. How long have you been in that business?—A. Twenty years.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. At the same time, would you be able to say that you are familiar with conditions in the industries other than the one you are in?—A. From coming in contact with the people, quite so.

Q. You have down there beside the Canadian Coloured Cottons, the Howard Smith Pulp and Paper Company, the Beech Furniture Factory, the McGill Chair Factory, the Cornwall Pants Company, in which about 75 per cent are female workers, the Courtalds Silk Factory, in which there are in the neighbourhood of 500 employees, and the Ives Modern Bedstead Company. In all of these industries there are both male and female employees?—A. Male and female, yes.

Q. That will tell us how much ground you can cover, and give us your opinion not only as an operative, but as a citizen living there. How long have you been working in Cornwall?—A. Twenty years next spring.

Q. And previous to that were you employed at Hamilton and Dundas?—A. Yes, Hamilton, Dundas and Merritton.

Q. And at one time were you not employed to go over to England to select desirable persons to work in the industries in Canada?—A. I went over in March, 1920, for the Canadian Cottons.

Q. And you secured these people and brought them to this country?—A. Yes, and if it had been possible I could have brought three shiploads, but I could not get accommodation for them.

Q. Now, will you proceed? If there is anything you have to tell the committee, we will be glad to hear it. How many women and girls would you say you have in your department?—A. Between 90 and 100 in all.

Q. That is, in the weaving department?—A. No, in the finishing and napping, and I would say about twenty-five per cent of them would be female help.

Q. Now, the napping department consists in putting the finish on goods, putting what is called a nap on it?—A. Yes, puts a nap on it; makes flannelette out of it.

Q. Now, what are the youngest girls you have in your employ?—A. We have a minimum wage for female employees in Ontario.

Q. Then you are acting under the Ontario Minimum Wage Statute?—A. Quite so.

Q. And you have to report to the Ontario government regularly through the mill?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. How long has that minimum wage been in existence?—A. I think since about 1921 or '22; I am not positive.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. What is the lowest wage you pay to any girl?—A. In my department, ten dollars a week. That is for an inexperienced girl about 18 years of age. That is the minimum. The law is that we cannot start them at less than ten dollars a week—that is, nine dollars a week for the first six months, and ten dollars a week for the next six months.

By the Chairman:

Q. And they can work up to what maximum?—A. The maximum is eleven dollars for an experienced adult female.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. The maximum-minimum, as it were?—A. The maximum-minimum.

Q. They are paid higher than that?—A. Quite so. I have two girls now, one is not yet 20 years of age, while the other is a young married woman, working on cutting blankets after they are napped—they are cut into pairs and folded—and I saw the payroll for this week, and I noticed particularly it was $19.85 for each of them.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. For four days?—A. No, sir, fifty hours.

By Mr. White (Mount Royal):

Q. They work on piece work?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Now, besides that $19 a week that these young girls earn, or the ten dollars that the younger ones earn, up to about six weeks ago they were entitled to a bonus?—A. Yes.

Q. That bonus as I understand it, was given to them on condition that there were a certain number of days they must not lose in three months—the bonus was paid every three months?—A. Yes, sir. There was a standard of production set by the company which was very low, and for every one-half of one per cent production over that standard they were paid one-half of one per cent of the total earnings for three months, as a bonus.

By the Chairman:

Q. The total earnings of the company?—A. No, the total earnings of the operative. For instance, if an operative worked thirteen weeks at ten dollars a week, she would get $130, and would get a bonus of one-half of one per cent of that.

By the Chairman:

Q. One two-hundredth of that?—A. Yes. That is, for every one-half of one per cent of production. Now, it was possible to make from eight to fifteen per cent over the standard. This has been made in Cornwall, so that she

would get seven and a half per cent of that $130. In the Dundas mill—that is, in the blanket mill—as much as thirty per cent has been made. The last bonus they paid in the Dundas mill was fifteen per cent to the operative, that is thirty per cent over the standard production, which was 65 per cent.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. What would that bring the total wage to?—A. Of course, that would all depend. It would be like 15 per cent over their standard wage. Whatever the production percentage over the standard would be, it would be that percentage over their standard wage. That amount taken off would be that much reduction, of course.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Now, besides that, there is a system of insurance—A. It is not insurance.

Q. I will tell you what I mean by that. The company have a blanket insurance over all their employees. It is called "insurance," but it is more properly speaking, a bonus, that if an employee has worked for the company a certain number of years and kept steadily at his work, and should be disabled, either through ill health or accident, there is a percentage coming to him running up as high as $1,500 in accordance with the number of years, having started, I think, at five years.—A. They start at six months after they are employed. A new hand comes in and becomes eligible for that bonus in six months. They are then entitled to $500 if anything happens to them, which is paid at death. For an old hand like myself; they started us at $500;—when that bonus was first started they started it at $1,000, and the maximum was $1,500. I have now what you might call a policy for $1,500.

By the Chairman:

Q. That policy is against accident and old age?—A. Not accident, no. It is payable if the Compensation Board is not drawn on, but if you become unable to continue your vocation in the mill, through loss of sight or accident in any way like that, then it is paid. I have two men in my department who are drawing it; they are paid so much every month.

By Mr. White (Mount Royal):

Q. And the premiums are paid wholly by the company?—A. Altogether by the company, yes. It is not handled by any insurance company by any means. By agreement we are supposed to report persons who are sick, no matter how long they are out; it is up to the overseers to report for them and to know what is the matter with them. He knows he has a hand who is out through illness, and he reports to the office of the mill that so and so is absent on account of sickness.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. With regard to that minimum wage for girls: your opinion is that it is a reasonable amount to keep a girl in decency? Has it worked out apparently as a reasonable proposition?—A. I have not tried to form any opinion on that. I cannot say right offhand, but I have never had any complaints of dissatisfaction. In fact, I have absolutely no trouble in getting girls. They prefer to work in my department for ten dollars a week, rather than in some other department for eleven or twelve.

Q. Has it appeared to you it is any hardship on the company to pay that wage?—A. No, not that ten dollars, no. It has not appeared to me to be any undue hardship, because the company has been able to pay dividends right along.

Q. The reference in our resolution before this committee is to the effect that the principle of the minimum wage as it applied to female labour should be extended to male labour. You have male labour in connection with your factory too?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think it would be a reasonable thing to set a minimum for the male as well as the female? That is what we are getting at in this committee.—A. Well, I hardly agree with that, because as I say, being head of a department, and having no trouble at all, I see no necessity for it. It appears to me personally that it is not giving the good man a chance. For instance, if I were bound to give everybody on a certain job, tending nappers, for instance, a certain amount, I would have to discharge some of them. You see, I have two machine jobs, and I have three machine jobs which pay more, and if a man eventually does not become competent, when tried on the three machines, if he cannot run that work, I would say "You cannot do that; you will have to take that much less money and run two machines."

Q. Did you ever discharge any girls for not being competent?—A. No, I have not.

Q. What I am getting at is simply this, that apparently the minimum wage for girls is working out satisfactorily; how could there be any more trouble with a minimum wage for the male employees?—A. I do not say that there would be any more trouble; I do not see why there should. It would depend, from the manufacturing end of it, what the minimum wage was.

Q. We had some evidence with regard to that the other day, from the standpoint of the social workers. What do you think a man ought to receive in your town in order to keep a family in decency? Have you any idea of the wages?

The CHAIRMAN: How many in the family?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We were going the other day with a small family, three children.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, a family of five, including the father and mother.

Mr. WHITE (Mount Royal): Young children; not children old enough to become self-supporting.

The WITNESS: I have young married men of that description working for me, and I have no trouble with them at all. They seem to be living; some of them own motor boats, and they go down the river fishing on week ends and holidays, and all I have to pay them is $15 a week.

By the Chairman:

Q. $60 a month?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. You pay them $15 a week and you pay all unmarried girls $10?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that the expenses of a man and his wife and three children would not be greater than one-half as much as a girl's?—A. Of course, but I am speaking about dissatisfaction, and what is apparently necessary. I understood that is the way I was to answer that.

Q. How could a man and his wife and three children live on $15 a week if it takes $10 to keep a girl?

The CHAIRMAN: I don't see how a family of five could begin to exist on $60 a month.

Mr. BELL (St. John): It does not necessarily mean that because a girl gets $10 a week that she can save very much money.

The WITNESS: I don't suppose they have any luxuries, but they seem to be quite happy and contented.

The CHAIRMAN: That would not even bring them up to the minimum subsistence standard which we had.

Mr. HAMILTON: No, but that was merely a matter of pencil and paper.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. How many young married men in the town you live in, that you know, are running motor boats, worth anywhere from $300 to $600, but also running automobiles—men working in your mill?—A. I cannot say how many. I know there are two in my department.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Do you mean to say that a motor boat has been purchased out of the earnings of a man who is getting only $15 a week?

Mr. HAMILTON: Where else would they get it?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am asking the witness. How can a man, his wife, and three children live and run a motor boat on $15 a week?

The WITNESS: I cannot see how they can, really. I am often amazed at what they do, and just how they do it. I know they do it, but just how they do it, I cannot understand.

By Mr. White (Mount Royal):

Q. Have you any idea of the monthly rental for the houses these families live in?—A. There was a man working for me with whom I was talking who said he was paying $15, and they raised his rent to $17, and he said it would be pretty hard, earning $15 a week and paying $17 a month rent.

Q. But that is not for a very large house, I suppose?—A. No, it is not a large house, by any means.

Q. It is a typical working man's house?—A. It is a typical working man's house, with all modern conveniences in it.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. What do the young unmarried men have to pay for room and board?—A. Eight dollars a week.

Q. For board and room?—A. Yes.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I know of a case at home of a prominent firm who had two employees getting $17.50 a week, and who had motor cars. The firm feared pilfering and stealing, and they investigated. They found there was no opportunity for stealing, so the manager sent for these men and questioned them. Their explanation was this: that they managed to buy the car, and the gas they used did not require as large an expenditure as going to the movies, and floating around the city; on holidays and Sundays and evenings they went out in the country, and probably took their kettle with them, and some bread and jam, and it kept them from going to the movies, and they spent their extra money in the car rather than on the town sights.

The CHAIRMAN: Still, to buy that car, and pay for it would require a certain amount of saving.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): They saved a little to buy it. They could buy a good second-hand car for $500 or $600, or perhaps a new Ford. The management suspected pilfering, but there was no possible way for them to steal, and they asked for an explanation from these men, and that was the explanation given.

The WITNESS: The same condition exists right in Cornwall. You can go up town and see the same faces from the industries; they cannot miss that moving picture. Just as this gentleman (Mr. Black) says, those who don't go to the movies spend their money for gasoline for running down the river to fish, and they would probably catch enough fish to feed them for half a week.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Do any of them cultivate their own gardens?—A. Oh yes, a great many of them.

Q. Is there good fishing there?—A. Yes; there is good fishing around Lancaster, a few miles down the river.

Q. Do they fish on Sunday there?—A. No, not in Ontario. Well, they do, but they don't let them; it is against the law.

By the Chairman:

Q. Those men who are getting $15 a week, Mr. Hewitson, are working on machines? They are machine men?—A. Yes, tending machines; looking after the goods on the machines; the machines practically look after themselves.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. You are only speaking for the department you yourself run?—A. Yes.

Q. To your own personal knowledge, do you know what price other people get in different sections of that mill—men who have families? They are not getting $15 a week; some of them get five dollars a day?—A. Yes, working for the company.

Q. The ones you speak of are simply people who stand in front of the loom, and the loom does the work. All the man has to do is to knit up the threads and let the loom do the work; they do not even have to shift the shuttle.—A. There are a lot of farmers came down from Embrun, and I can place these men right to work. They are inexperienced, but it is only a matter of looking after the cloth.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. What proportion of the men in your department receive wages like that? —A. A very large proportion of the men in my department do not receive any more than $17 a week.

By the Chairman:

Q. What percentage of the men in your department would you say get no more than $15 a week?—A. Fifty per cent.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. What is the average wage for a skilled mechanic?—A. We have heads of departments, and assistants, and section hands, and then we have machine tenders; the machine tenders get $15 a week, the section hands get $15.50, the second hands get $30 a week, and the overseers go higher.

By the Chairman:

Q. What would the overseers get?—A. $50 a week.

Q. That means you have about four classes of wage earners?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. You have only one overseer for each department?—A. Yes; there is an overseer of weaving, and an overseer of spinning, and an overseer of carding, a master mechanic, an overseer of dyeing, and an overseer of every branch of the industry.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would these men who start at $15 a week gradually work up to $50?—A. I am one of them. I started weaving in Dundas. My sister taught me to weave. From weaving I got on to the loom fixing, and from loom fixing I got to be an assistant second hand, and from second hand I got to be foreman, overseer of the loom. They took me from the weaving and put me in the finishing department. That is how I progressed in the business.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. But it is only one man in a group who rises to this position; the rest will remain in more or less subordinate positions?—A. Yes; but we do not have in our industry the material. I wish we had. I have positions now paying from $15.50 to $18 and we are looking for men with enough education and ability to fill those positions. I have men in the positions, of course, but I would very much like to have men to fill them better.

Q. Have you any system of apprenticeship for training these men for thoroughly going into the industry?—A. No system at all, only at the overseer's discretion. If I get hold of a smart young man, who has started to work for me for $15 a week, I will say "there is something in him; there is a good young man; I will put him on fixing"—that is a raise of fifty cents a week—"and I will try to advance him". I am now looking for a second hand which position pays $25 a week.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do any of the girls from the factory, who marry, come back to work?—A. They have done so, yes.

Q. At what age do you take the children on in the factory?—A. Not under sixteen, without a special permit. There is some kind of a Board—

Mr. HAMILTON: I know there is a requirement there for them to bring a certified certificate that they are of that age. You cannot get it on the parents' recommendation; you have to get a certified registration of birth to show your age.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Are there special permits below sixteen?

Mr. HAMILTON: You can take them at sixteen if they produce a certified registration of birth showing they are sixteen.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I thought the witness said there was some system of permits below that.

The WITNESS: There is in Ontario; there is a system—I cannot think of the name of it.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the Adolescent School Law. You have to go to school now until 16, and you cannot take any boy or girl into a factory until they are 16.

The WITNESS: I have never employed any, but I understood there was such a law.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Have you any labour organization in your factory?—A. None whatever.

Q. Has there been any effort made by the men to organize themselves?—A. No; there have been no efforts made, and no trouble in my time—in the 20 years I have worked in Cornwall.

Q. Has there been any refusal on the part of the management to permit the men to organize?—A. No, there has been no discussion of which I can remember.

By the Chairman:

Q. How many employees are there in your factory?—A. In the factory in which I work there are about 340 male and about 240 female.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. How do the wages you pay compare with those paid for similar work in the United States?—A. I think they are some less.

Q. Lower on the Canadian side?—A. Yes, some less.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Beside the Canadian Coloured proper, there are a number of employees in the Dundas branch?—A. Yes.

Q. The Dundas mill is part of the Canadian Coloured?—A. Yes.

Q. How many have you there?—A. In the Dundas we have 159 male and 103 female, or 262 altogether.

Q. Then we come to the Stormont branch.—A. 351. That is 1202 hands employed by our company in the cotton industry.

By the Chairman:

Q. About 600 in Cornwall alone?—A. In the cotton mill. These three mills are all in Cornwall. We have a mill in New Brunswick too.

Q. You have no employees under 18 years of age?—A. Oh, yes, there are some at 16.

Q. You can employ them at 16?—A. Yes.

Q. But no less?—A. Not supposed to.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Now then, how many of the men who are superintendents and bosses in the Canadian Coloured Cotton system in the town, have grown up from the jobs they started at, bobbin boys, to where they are getting $50 a week?—A. I would have to think that out.

Q. You know the boss of the Stormont mill?—A. Yes, Mr. Locui.

Q. He began at the bottom?—A. Yes.

Q. And is getting $50 a week now as boss weaver?—A. I would say so.

Q. Do you know the boss weaver in the Canada branch?—A. Mr. Grey, yes.

Q. He has gone up, filling all stages until he is boss weaver?—A. Yes, he worked for me as a boss weaver.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can he get any higher wage than this $50 a week?—A. It has never been demanded.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. In regard to this man Locui: you know his surroundings and his position in life?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that he has more than the ordinary comforts of living that a man should have? What would be considered a higher position in the town from a financial standpoint, or whether he enjoys life?—A. I think he has all the comforts that are necessary for a man.

Q. Owns his own buildings?—A. Yes.

Q. Has he educated his children well?—A. Yes.

Q. And has everything comfortable?—A. Yes, and he has a motor car.

Q. And has a motor boat too?—A. Yes.

Q. Now let us take Mr. Grey. He has thoroughly educated his family?—A. Yes.

Q. And I believe that the mill has made an arrangement with him to buy a home on condition that he would pay so much a month toward it; is that so? —A. Yes; he has told me that. I can give evidence in regard to that myself. In 1921 I was living in a rented house and working for the company. The house was sold over my head. The landlord did not even give me an opportunity to buy it, because I would have bought it as I was quite comfortable—just as comfortable as I ever was in Cornwall. I spoke to our manager, and he said "You will have to have a house," and I said "Yes, but the only way to get one is to buy one, and I have not got the money; I have five children of my own, and they are pretty extravagant, I must admit that, and they have used up some of my earnings." He said "How much do you want," and I said "About $2,000." He said "Go ahead and buy the house; you can have it," and he gave me $2,000.

By the Chairman:

Q. He loaned you $2,000?—A. Yes, at a very low rate of interest.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. How many of these men with lower salaries own their own homes?—A. There are more at low salaries who own their own houses than there are with big salaries. That is a fact. You would be surprised to see them go up, and they are really comfortable living quarters, which, in my position, I would not be ashamed to live in, many of them. They do a lot of work themselves at night. They put them up much cheaper than I could put up a house myself. They will get together and have a "bee" and say "We will put up another storey," or "We will put on the clapboards," and finally they have mighty nice living quarters.

By the Chairman:

Q. They put the houses up the way they used to put up the barns in the early days?—A. They are certainly comfortable; there is no getting away from that.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. How does the rate of wage compare with Quebec?—A. It is better.

By Mr. White (Mount Royal):

Q. Better pay?—A. A little better pay in Ontario than in Quebec.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Do you represent a company which has mills in Quebec?—A. No, not in Quebec.

By Mr. White (Mount Royal):

Q. Are you thinking of a place like Magog or Montreal?—A. Montreal or Valleyfield. I am not speaking with positive knowledge with regard to that, but I have had men come and apply for work and they have told me we paid better wages than they paid in Valleyfield.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Have you had much of a migration from Cornwall to the States on account of the higher wages?—A. There has been a lot go to Detroit, particularly the young men, but I would say 90 per cent of those who went have landed right back home. That is not this year, but within the last two years. There have been a lot of young men who have gone to Detroit when the boom was on, but I think I am safe in saying that, yes, 99 per cent of them have come back home.

By the Chairman:

Q. How many of them stayed away?—A. Of course some of them would remain a few months.

Q. Just to size up the situation and come back?—A. Yes; of course there are one or two, whom I have in mind particularly, who are still there. They worked for us. They were home for a visit at Christmas. I am thinking particularly of the sons of Mr. Lefebvre.

By Mr. Black (Halifax):

Q. I suppose those $50 men are earning more than the corner grocer or the the owners of small shops?—A. I do not know what the turnover would be. I have not the slightest idea of what a man in the grocery business in Cornwall would make.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Have you lost many of your families lately on account of low wages—families which desired higher wages?—A. There has not been any dissatisfaction at all. There has been none going around that I can recall. I do not think of any who have approached me.

Q. What would you say about the appearance of the young women on the streets—the young women who work in your mill—as regards dress and comforts, compared with the best people in town—the very best citizens in the town?—A. There is no question about it, if any of these gentlemen (the committee) happened to take a walk through the town, they would say "There is some dress here; some money here somewhere." They are getting their dresses from somewhere, and they are certainly dressed as good as my children. My children are not dressed as good as some of the others.

Q. And those are the daughters and wives of the men who work in this mill? —A. Yes. Of course, in a great many of these cases, the father would be working, and would have probably two or three children working as well.

The CHAIRMAN: That makes a different situation, where you have the father of the family working, and one or two in the family working also. They are drawing quite a bit of money then. I can see how a family can thrive on a fairly low wage in that way, but take, for instance, a mechanic getting $15 a week. He is a married man; has a family of, say, three children; if he has not some interest in some property or some money coming in from somewhere, he cannot live on that $15 a week, can he?

Mr. WHITE (Mount Royal): Yes, he can, Mr. McIntosh. He can live on four times his rental. The witness put his rental at $15 a month. He can live on $60 a month. There is a certain class of people who spend more than four times their rental—they spend five or six times.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Does not one of your sons work in the paper mill, or did for a while?—A. Yes.

Q. In the machine shop?—A. Yes. I think he gets 45 cents or 48 cents an hour, something like that. Of course, in the paper mill their wages are about the same as ours. We have to keep a standard of wages pretty close to one another, because if we did not there would be too much changing. We have men who will have some difference of opinion with the overseer or second hand or section hand, and he will throw up his hands in the cotton mill and go to the paper mill, and vice versa; so the wages are pretty much the same. They probably would be more graded in the paper mill than the cotton mill. There are higher paid men in the paper industry than in the cotton industry, because there is heavier work.

By Mr. Bell (St. John):

Q. And steady employment?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Twelve months a year?—A. Twelve months a year. There is absolutely no appearance of poverty in Cornwall, and the travellers with whom I talked during the period of quietness in 1923 and 1924 said that Cornwall was about the best town there was along the line between Montreal and Toronto.

By the Chairman:

Q. You work 50 hours a week?—A. Yes; nine hours for five days, and five hours on Saturday.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. What is the general appearance of the whole town for comfort and for lack of poverty?—A. Well, there is no poverty there. I cannot see there is any poverty, but there is every appearance of prosperity and comfort and happiness right throughout.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would the average family connected with the industrial establishment about which you are giving evidence have sufficient money to see to the education of the members of the family, if any of the members wished to go forward in school? I think that is an important thing, that there be something in that family with which to equip the children of that family if they wish to go into another channel of life, and not be tied up forever and a day to a particular industrial establishment?—A. There are a great many of which I know in the east end of town who are sending their children to high school or to business college at the present time.

Q. That would be interesting evidence if we could find the number of children from these families who have not stopped at the public schools, but have gone on and taken their high school education and their collegiate education, and gone out into life to fill other and more important positions.—A. There have been a good many, but my idea is different from some others. Take my own two boys, for instance. There is no man who would have done more than I would for them; I would have gone without shoes to help them get an education, but they would not have it. You will find in most families in Cornwall there are some who will not have an education. They see other young fellows who are working out with their motor boats, and having money to spend, and they want to get to working themselves. A workingman cannot send his boy to college and give him a college education, and hand him out money to spend, and there are many boys who will not sacrifice that little pleasure for an education. My own two boys would not have it.

Q. That is a problem of home training—that some want to remain in an industrial pursuit?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything further?

Mr. WHITE (Mount Royal): We might thank this witness for coming here.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are thankful to you, Mr. Hewitson, for coming here and giving us this information.

The witness discharged.

The committee adjourned until Tuesday, June 1, 1926, at 11.00 A.M.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, June 1, 1926.

The Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations met at 11 a.m., the Chairman, Mr. McIntosh, presiding.

JOHN WALKER MACMILLAN, Chairman, Ontario Minimum Wage Board, called and sworn.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, and hon. gentlemen, I have here the minutes of evidence of one of your sessions in which Mr. Gerald Brown gave a sketch of the situation throughout the world generally, in respect to minimum wage legislation, so I need say nothing about that.

The driving force of minimum wage legislation is merely the principle of the assertion of the preciousness of human life, its popularity and its strength. Since 1894 when, as a practical plan, it was suggested in New England, it has spread with rapidity over practically the whole world of western civilization. Its driving force has not been that it is a wise economic expedient, or anything of that sort, but that within the realm of industry, it has asserted the right to live. The essential principle of the minimum wage is the same as the essential principle, for instance, of the law against murder, which is based, of course, upon the preciousness of human life. At bottom, the minimum wage does not ask how profitable an industry is, although in practical administration that has to be considered, nor does it ask how effective the protection of the worker is, but again in practical administration that has to be thought of. It asserts the right of a person to live, and where one gives his time and strength in certain employment, to then demand that that employment shall return to him at least enough to provide for his necessary human wants; that he shall have enough to eat, enough to wear, sufficient shelter, and such modest comforts and conveniences as are accepted by the society in which he lives, as being necessary to wholesome subsistence.

Mr. Chairman, I have, during seven years, now and more, been active in this work. I was Chairman of the Board in Manitoba for two years, and I have been Chairman of the Board in Ontario for five years and a half.

By the Chairman:

Q. What years were you in Manitoba?—A. 1917 to 1919. We began there. We began in Ontario in 1920. We have in both places followed the plan of consulting employers and employees; we have in both these places covered employers' association wherever we found them, and we have found a great many where there were no organized associations of employers, and we have there done our best to select representative employers. We have over forty orders issued in Ontario. The number was less than that in Manitoba, but it was a considerable number, and I wish to state to the committee that I have not heard in any one of these consultations with employers or employees, this principle challenged. Universally, employers have told us that they do not want workers to work for them unless they pay them enough to live on. So, I would like to make it plain in the beginning of my remarks here, that the very convincing appeal which the Minimum Wage principle makes to the world, is of this nature; it is the assertion of the preciousness—or if you prefer, sacredness; the supreme sacredness of human life,—the right of the worker to live from his work.

In Canada, as Mr. Brown told you, there was such a law in seven provinces out of nine. In Prince Edward Island, which is not at all an industrial province, there has, so far as I know, been no suggestion of a law of this kind. In New Brunswick a Commission was appointed some time ago which I know has studied this problem, because we have had correspondence with them. I have, however, heard of no report they have issued. The other seven provinces have such a law, although Nova Scotia has not put its law into effective operation as yet. In Quebec the Minimum Wage Law is in operation, and I understand they hope to issue their first order before long. In the other provinces the law has been at work for several years. I may say that I believe in these other provinces, there is the same general support from employers and employees as we have found in Manitoba and Ontario.

In Canada, we have followed the lead of the United States, and have applied these laws only to women and girls, although in some of the States of the United States, they are applying them to male minors, those under 18. In none of the States have they applied to adult males. This is universal in Canada, with the recent exception that British Columbia has passed a law in which they have not included men within the precincts of the statute which covers female employees, but have drafted a separate law. I have not heard that they have as yet issued an order. This breaks from the general experience of the world. In New Zealand, and in Victoria—for the province of Victoria in Australia, was the laboratory where this matter was wrought out, and where it was studied by Commissions from many parts of the world before it spread—there was a period from 1896 to about 1910, that this province of Victoria was working this out. It was genuinely a popular movement, rather than a labour movement or a capitalistic movement; that is, a movement that was directed to encourage employers and employees. The Labour Unions gave it at first, rather hesitant support; the employers being still more hesitant, and the forces behind it being public approval of that sentiment, which I mentioned at first, of the right to live from one's work. The reason why the United States has applied it only to women, is, I believe, twofold; in the first place, the American Federation of Labour, the organization which represents for the most part, organized labour within the United States directly opposed its application to men, while supporting its application to women and to minors, both boys and girls; there being the natural idea that self help was better for the male adult than State help, and the fear that legislation might weaken the strength of the Unions. Another reason was, I believe, their dread of what the Supreme Court of the United States might do about it, a trouble which we have not had to face in Canada. We, in this principle of social legislation, as in a number of others have followed the example of the United States, rather than the example of parts of the British Empire. Indeed, these things seem to be routed to us through the United States, so the Workmen's Compensation came and the Minimum Wage and there is every indication that other forms of social legislation are travelling the same route.

In New Zealand and Australia, and all these provinces of Great Britain, and generally through Europe, where, in one form or another, Minimum Wage Laws generally prevail—and I understand also in the Union of South Africa—the Minimum Wage Laws apply as readily to men's wages as to women's, the idea being that the wages need protection, rather than the female or male should get the protection. Of course, it is obvious that female workers are much less organized than male workers. We have in Canada some 260,000 or 270,000 members of trades unions. That is less than ten per cent of those who are gainfully employed in the Dominion of Canada. There are no definite figures as to how many of these trade unionists are females, but the proportion is quite small. There seems to be no reason, sir, why if this principle is good for

women's wages, it should not be applied at least to some classes of men's wages, with the provision that a proper type of law should first be passed, and then that the proper type of administration of this law should be applied.

Now, in regard to the proper type of law: there have been on this continent two types of laws, one known as the "Flat Rate Law", and the other as the "Commission" law. The Flat Rate Law is in vogue in several of the United States, such as Utah, and states not greatly industrialized, and the first essay of minimum wage registration in Canada was by the province of Alberta, and was a law of this kind. The province of Alberta has, however, since then, changed its law, and has a Commission law. The Flat Rate law merely consists of writing into the Factory Act of the province a provision declaring that no wage shall be less than such and such a sum. The Flat Rate law is not an effective law, for two reasons, amongst others. In the first place, it does not engage the co-operation of the parties which are affected, which I think is vital; the employers and employees are not consulted, their interest is not secured, and it lacks flexibility in administration. The factory inspector carries the law in his hand. He has no authority to do more than say to the employers, "This is the law and you must obey it". He would not consider special circumstances, whereas a commission, which has been given by law general authority to do certain things, can administer that law in such a way as to suit particular cases, making a distinction between one trade and another, between one section of the province and another, and as the cost of living varies between the several sections, so can the commission differentiate when dealing with particular instances. Let me give you a trifling illustration which will show that. In minimum wage regulations, a very valuable one is that which deals with the proportion of experienced workers, for any minimum wage order will set only the cost of living wage for those who have learned the trade. Learners are partially producers, and partially pupils. In some trades, the amount of production they give at first is so very small that if the employer were required to pay any considerable wage, he would not take them on, and we would have no learners in that trade. It has happened in the past where that mistake has been made. It is a good principle that no employer shall be allowed to discharge his employees unless they have learned their trade. Regulations were put into a minimum wage order that not more than fifty per cent—that is the percentage we take in Ontario—of the employees, shall be learners and get less than an adult experienced minimum wage. There will be cases where a business is starting, or where an entirely new industry is starting, or where perhaps there has been a fire in the plant, or it has been closed down for a considerable time, where it is practically impossible to comply with that order for the time being, and where it is of the utmost importance that the employer should have at once a working force that is more than to a very slight extent experienced. In such a case, he has a right to a permit for six months or a year, to give him a chance to train some of his workers. A commission can do that kind of thing, while a factory inspector cannot. That is why I say the advantage of the commission form in point of flexibility is important. In minimum wage laws, then, there are these two things to be kept in mind: there is legislation, and there is administration, and I should suppose the important question before this committee is the matter of uniformity between the several provinces. I do not know whether it is to be decided that this is a matter for Dominion legislation or provincial legislation. It is, at least possible that it will be taken as a matter of provincial legislation, and I suppose it is also possible that some Dominion law might operate in a similar function to that in which the Service Law operates, that in which the Old Age Pension Law is supposed to operate, namely, that the Dominion will sit in with the provinces on some basis or other, and result in a harmonization throughout the several provinces. The point I wish to make is that it is of great importance that there should be harmony in administration

[Dr. J. W. MacMillan.]

of this form of legislation. You might have in the nine provinces of Canada, identical minimum wage laws, or you might have nine boards that would set nine different standards of wages. On the other hand, you might have nine laws that would vary very considerably; in one there might be a commission of five, and in another a commission of three; in one the commission might be entirely independent, and in the other it might have as chairman—as some of them have—the Deputy Minister of Labour, yet if they issued orders setting the same wage rate, there would be practical harmony between the several provinces. That is the point to keep in mind; that the harmonization is not to be effected adequately, simply by saying that the laws are the same, or very similar, nor is it to be momentarily accomplished any time, but it must be a continuous and progressive thing, by the administrators of the several provinces keeping constantly in touch with one another. I have been hoping that somebody would break in with a few questions by this.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I would like to ask you in regard to that harmony of legislation, if it would be harmony if they all fixed the same wage, with the different standards of living, such, for instance, as in Nova Scotia and British Columbia?—A. No. The harmony would have to be—and this is emphasized again—in the relation of what I was saying about the value of flexibility in administration. When these several boards meet together, or their representatives meet together, they would have to keep in mind a number of things, not only the difference in the cost of living, but probably competitive differences.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Doctor MacMillan, are you able to work out a budget in the case of girls, that is considered fairly satisfactory by the girls and by the employers? —A. I think we may fairly say that we have done that. It has been under fire from both sides very often, but it has stood for five and a half years.

Q. If so, do you think it would be possible to work out a budget in the case of a family, because I take it as a whole, we are thinking of a man's wages as not being merely for himself, but being used in the support of his family?—A. I think so.

Q. You think there would not be too great variation in the demands, to make that possible?—A. I see no reason why there should. Of course, any budget, like all human things, is complex, and there is room for argument pro and con, but there is also room for good sense and compromise, too. Family budgets have been worked out by a great many people, with a considerable amount of agreement, where the circumstances were similar. I see no reason why it should not be done.

Q. In the case of the girls' minimum wage, has there been any very great objection on the part of employers, or any undue hardship put on industry?—A. No. We have been very happy in the support of the employers. I have no hesitation in saying that the employers' associations—and I could name you a great list of them, including the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in Toronto—have helped us in a sympathetic fashion frequently, and we believe we enjoy their support. I think perhaps it should be interjected here, that the minimum wage should not be what is commonly known as a fair wage; the minimum wage should simply protect the cost of living. It should forbid the girls, as we say, from scrambling with each other for the crusts, but it should not forbid them competing for the prizes. I think this is very important, and there have been several illustrations in minimum wage administration. For instance, in Britain, in 1917 I think it was, they extended the Trades' Board Act to include practically all industries in Britain, and these Trades Boards, and these co-operative groups of employers and employees, met together from one trade

and another, and fixed certain wages. About that time, the movement was very general and wages were high; money was cheap, and a good many of those who already by Trade Union bargaining, had agreed upon wages that were comparatively high, simply met and ratified by law these Trade Union agreements. A year or two passed; the great slump came; unemployment was general; the trades had difficulty in maintaining themselves; both employers and employees recognized that things had changed; money was dearer; prices were falling; it was inevitable that wages should fall. If it had been simply a matter of Trade Union agreements, they would have met and reduced the agreements, but knowing that the wages were legally enforcible, they could not do that; it was much less easy. That is the principal part of the report of what was known as the Lord Cave Commission, and the evidence taken there was practically universally in support of the minimum wage as a device for protecting the low paid workmen, and for protecting the subsistence level, but to attempt to make it a device for the general raise of wages, to attempt to make it a device for fixing wages generally, is not consonant, I think, with that moral principle which I instanced, and which I think is logically to be connected with minimum wage administration.

Q. Do you think there is any real ground for the objection on the part of labour, that the minimum wage tends to become a maximum?—A. No; all experience has disproved that. The wage sheet of a factory—of almost every factory—runs from low wages to high wages, and the supposition of that criticism is that an employer, if forced to pay more money to his cheaper workers, will recompense himself by taking it out of the pay envelopes of the better paid workrs. That has never happened, I believe. Of course, wages are affected by many things besides minimum wages, and administration, but it tends to raise, I think, perhaps not to a great extent—it has, as you might say, a sort of telescopic effect—the rates, and the variations between the workers are still maintained. There is no doubt of that, as a matter of practical experience.

Q. From the standpoint of the employer, do you think it would add very greatly to the cost of production, so as to make it an undue hardship upon Canadian industry?—A. It is generally understood, along the line upon which I am speaking, that minimum wages should never be set so as to be such as would generally raise wages throughout the country; it should be a wage that would cut off the unsocially low wage, and protect the earner. Without doubt, one reason why we have been supported so strongly by supporters, is that we have protected them against a certain type of social competitor, who have tried to pay unwholesomely low wages. That being the case, the higher wages are not raised except as incidentally and indirectly they are in variation with the low. All that has been done is to cut off the unsocially low wage. We have not found any injury to any plant, but we have found, on the other hand, a great deal of assistance has been given to a great many plants. No doubt it tends to promote efficiency.

Q. There is a practical difficulty, Doctor MacMillan, that would be encountered in dealing with male wages. In the case of girls, presumably their needs are all more or less the same; they need so much food, so much clothing, need so much for room and recreation, and so on, but in the case of men, they have not only these requirements, but they may have a great many family obligations. A man may be single, or he may have a wife to support, or he may have a wife and one, two, three, four, five or six children. In that case, the fixation of a minimum wage should enable him to meet a situation of this kind.—A. There is a complex situation there, a problem of industry, that is by no means solved as yet. The supposition is, of course, that the woman's wage is an individual wage; a man's wage is a family wage. At the same time, as a matter of fact, the man's wage is not in that relation to the woman's wage.

As the student of wages works it out, he commonly takes as a typical family a man, his wife, and three children under fourteen years of age. Then they say —or at least the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics says—that that group of five requires three and a third times as much, roughly, as an individual does. Now, on that basis, the man's family wage ought to be three and a third times the size of the woman's wage. As a matter of fact, however, throughout the United States, the male wages are just about twice what the woman's wages are, and the complaint is much more as to the lowness of women's wages than men's wages. The thing does not fit. There has been, in recent years, an attempt to meet that difficulty in France. The Family Allowance Scheme has been instituted, by which the workman gets paid his wage as a worker, and gets paid an extra amount in accordance with the number of his dependents, the fund from which that is taken being either pooled within the industry, or provided for in some other way, to avoid the employer discharging the men with children, and keeping on the bachelors. It is, however, only in process of experimentation, but is being carefully studied.

Q. It would not be fair to charge that family responsibility on the individual basis?—A. No, it would simply mean dismissing the men with children.

By Mr. Ross (Kingston):

Q. Is there not another object connected with that too?—A. To encourage families?

Q. Sure.—A. No doubt they are thinking of that in France.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. Doctor MacMillan, you are speaking now for the province of Ontario? —A. Yes.

Q. Beyond that you have no control, as regards the minimum wage? Is that true?—A. Ours is the Ontario Board.

Q. You simply represent the requirements of the Minimum Wage Board of the province of Ontario?—A. Yes.

Q. That being the case, have you found, as a general thing, that there have been complaints as to the wages of the operatives in the province of Ontario, as to the amount which they are getting?—A. You mean the need of this legislation?

Q. The need of the rise in wages —because I understand we are only dealing with families?—A. Yes, our Board deals only with families. I am glad you asked me that question, because it brings out a point which throws some light on our situation here. In the literature you find on the subject, you will very commonly find the expression "The sweated trades". There are trades where good wages generally prevail, and there are others where poor wages generally prevail, but we have not found, in Canada at least, what might be called "sweated industries". While there are diffences between one and another, the differences are slight, and the variation is between industries. It is within each industry, and it is astonishing what you will find; two factories within a few blocks of each other, buying ther raw materials in the same market, selling their finished product in the same market drawing their working forces from the same community, and yet one is paying wages averaging twenty per cent, twenty-five per cent, and we have found them actually paying double the wages in the one plant than in the other, and we have found the one paying the higher wages is the more profitable business.

Dscussion followed.

By Miss MacPhail:

Q. Doctor MacMillan, do you not think if domestic service came under the Minimum Wage Board, it would tend to raise the status of the domestic worker? It always has struck me as being a very peculiar thing that while we

have always tried to idealize the home, draw attention to it as being the finest thing on earth, yet the workers in that home consider themselves in a degraded social position, more degraded than a factory worker or an office worker, or any other sort of worker. Do you think it would help to raise the status of the domestic worker if it should come under the Minimum Wage Board?—A. That is a very intricate problem, Miss MacPhail. Social status is universally existant, and to many people social status is of enormous importance. We have found, for instance, a boarding house keeper in Toronto who would take in a girl who worked in a factory, but would not take one in who worked in a laundry. Think of the delicate distinction between those two. The office assistant thinks herself above the sales girl, and so on all the way up until we come to the lady in the house on the hill, who would give her right arm to get an invitation to another house, probably only a block away. It is strange indeed the difference in the different classes of work. The lady on the hill probably has in her mind precisely the same thought as had the girl in the factory or the office. We have one great illustration as regards the nursing occupation. Sairy Gamp was a social outcast. Then came Florence Nightingale and the establishment of the whole nursing profession, which altered the whole situation. At the same time, the nurse has become impossible for the budget of an ordinary family.

Discussion followed.

By Miss MacPhail:

Q. Do you think that girls look on domestic service as a degrading occupation?—A. The social status is very powerful in both men and women. Take it racially, for instance, where you have a mixture of races; those on the committee who come from the west probably know of the great race mixture in the northern part of Winnipeg, where the social status is very sharply defined.

Discussion followed.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. Doctor MacMillan, in connection with your work with regard to minimum wages for girls, have you found it necessary to safeguard the standards of the family? I know it is outside of your immediate work, but has it been brought to your notice that we should have a minimum wage which would safeguard the interests of the family?—A. I suppose you mean, Mr. Woodsworth, any incidental evidence that has come to us for the need for protecting men's wages?

Q. Yes.—A. I may say that we hear now and again from people who are under the impression that the minimum wage law does apply to men, and receive complaints as to low wages, which shows—whether to the same extent as yet or not, I do not know—that the same variation in wages applies in men's trades as in women's trades.

By Mr. Ross (Kingston):

Q. I think it would be interesting if you would give us your methods of administration?—A. I would be very glad to.

By Mr. Woodsworth:

Q. You found the need, did you?—A. We had evidence of variation in men's wages, which goes with low wages—unsocially low wages, yes.

Q. May I ask you, before you pass to the question of Doctor Ross, inasmuch as you have studied this question for a number of years, and have already suggested certain things which might be followed in minimum wage legislation as between the two provinces, have you any suggestion, out of your experience, to offer as to the way in which we can most profitably advance along the line of minimum wage legislation at the present time? I feel

sure that the committee would like the benefit of your study of this whole question.—A. I don't know that I have. I might say this much: there is another step for us to take while the law applies to women only, and that is to bring the Boards of the several provinces together in an attempt to harmonize our orders. We have made several moves in that direction, but have not succeeded yet in accomplishing anything definite. We meet now and again with representatives of the Boards of the other provinces, but only in an informal way. Our hope is that as Quebec, which next to Ontario is the leading industrial province of the Dominion, gets into line with the other provinces, we may be able to accomplish something, and hold regular meetings between the representatives of the Boards, talking over our problems, and perhaps harmonizing the orders. One difficulty I see in attempting co-operation between the Dominion and provincial authorities in regard to the minimum wage is that the same opportunity is not given on the provincial basis as regards employment service. I understand that the co-operation between the Dominion and the provinces is on this basis; that the Dominion pays a certain proportion, perhaps one-half of the cost of the employment service, and on the principle that he who pays half the fiddler calls half the tunes, I suppose, without having authority from the British North America Act, still does exert a great deal of influence. The same will be true for the Old Age Pensions if carried out,—a Dominion subsidy which will justify and support the Dominion co-operation with the provinces. The minimum wage legislation does not involve any considerable expenditure of money. The cost of the operation of the Board is very low, and while the provinces, I think, are always glad to get what they can, still there is not sufficient ground either for that type of co-operation, or any other. Upon what other ground it will be put, I do not know; I have not thought about it.

By Mr. Robinson:

Q. May I ask in connection with the laundry business, say, where a white man owns the laundry, and is up against the proposition of the Chinaman, who does not have to comply with the law or pay the minimum wage—how is that difficulty being solved, if at all?—A. We have talked that over with laundry men. The Chinese do not employ women; the Chinese laundry is almost entirely a hand laundry and not a machine laundry. As the Chinese do not employ women, we naturally have nothing to do with that part of their problem.

Q. It seems to me it makes it difficult for the company operating a steam laundry, when they have to compete with the Chinese.—A. Well, some of them thrive, but there would undoubtedly be more white laundries.

The CHAIRMAN: The question of efficiency is at stake.

Mr. ROBINSON: Not altogether. I think fifty per cent of the Chinese laundries are not sanitary anyway, to start with.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether there are any, but as far as the work is concerned, I do not think there is any comparison at all, from what I have seen.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Could we have an answer now to Mr. Ross' question?

By Mr. Heenan:

Q. Doctor MacMillan, in any of your decisions, where you establish a minimum wage, in any factory for girls, has there been any consideration given to the question of whether any of these employees might be widows with dependents?—A. No; the wage has been an individual wage.

Q. And the widow with one child—because the Mother's Allowance takes care of the others—would be placed in the same position as an unmarried girl.—A. Well, I don't see how we could avoid that. If we ruled on that, it would simply mean her dismissal. The difficulty, of course would be that the widow would be dismissed.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee that the question asked by Doctor Ross of Kingston be now answered?

Several MEMBERS: Carried.

The WITNESS: In the administration and the enforcement of these orders, our first act is to print a summary of the order, setting forth the wage rates and the other regulations, and we require this to be posted in each factory, and in a great many other business establishments, hotels, theatres, retail stores, etc. Some of our orders we have not felt we could treat in that way. We may have an office worker order, for instance, and there are so many offices that we cannot get a line on many of them, which perhaps have only one girl. In that case, of course, the requirements are not so severe in regard to that office, but we required that they be posted wherever it is necessary, and when we find an office where it would seem to be required, we require them to be posted in that office. They must be posted throughout factories and in places where women work. There is this card on the wall, where it can be seen by all the girls. We have the co-operation of the Bureau of Labour, and the Factory Inspectors; they are constantly going about the province visiting all these places, and every place they go where women are employed, they look to see if this order is posted. If it is not, they report to us, and we send another by registered mail, with the request that it be immediately posted. If we are compelled to send two or three orders to the same factory, we take it up with them particularly, and, if necessary, use a little pressure upon them. We get hundreds of complaints from employees, relatives of employees, and even a considerable number from employers. We investigate each one of these. A great many of them turn out to have nothing in them; others turn out to deserve investigation and correction, and we have corrected them by using our best judgment. We have only had to prosecute one single case in the province in the last five years, and we chose to prosecute that because we found it was a case of a man who was giving us false returns. We collected a considerable sum from him, and paid it to the girls involved, and we thought it wise to go to law with him, because he had deliberately misinformed us as to his employees. We probably could have collected more money from him had we so chosen. We depend very largely upon the co-operation of the Bureau of Labour, and we have good co-operation with the Chief Factory Inspector. We have half-yearly meetings with him, and go over every case, and we believe in that way our administration is pretty effective.

Discussion followed.

By Mr. Hamilton:

Q. In your study of this matter, Doctor MacMillan, have you found that the comforts and benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Board are of benefit to all classes of help?—A. I have no doubt. It is only incidentally that we come upon that; it is not directly in the path of our work, but all we do hear is very favourable to it. Speaking about the effective administration: there was a little incident in Toronto very recently which might interest the committee. For some years a committee of ladies had maintained a large boarding house known as Spadina Lodge, for low-paid girls, girls who could not afford to pay their board in the ordinary boarding houses. As one lady told me, they charged from nothing at all up to six dollars a week. Now, they closed that boarding house down early this year, and they give the Minimum Wage Board the credit for it. They said they found that on account of the protection of the girls' wages in Toronto, they no longer found any need for an institution of this kind. The girls preferred to pay their board, and did pay their board in the ordinary boarding houses. The building has been taken over by the University Settlement Board.

Discussion followed.

Mr. HAMILTON: I would move, in view of the fact that the evidence we have been called upon to submit to this committee, that it be received and the Chairman name a committee to take into consideration the evidence and make a report at our next meeting, to be then discussed and considered by the committee.

Mr. MCMILLAN: I second that.

Motion agreed to.

Discussion followed.

The committee adjourned until Tuesday, June 8, 1926, at 11 o'clock a.m.

(See final report at page v ante.)

Printed by
Hunter Rose Co-operative
Gardenvale

